

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JULY, 1862.

ART. I.—1. *Courte et simple méthode pour parvenir à une plus parfaite connaissance de la Sainte Cène ; suivie de la préparation nécessairement requise : pour l'avantage des jeunes Communians et de tous ceux qui n'ont pas assez bien réfléchi sur ce Sacrement : avec l'Office pour la Sainte Communion, ainsi que des avis et des instructions, convenables pour y prendre part d'une manière judicieuse et profitable.* Par le Très-Révérend Père en Dieu THOMAS WILSON, D.D. Evêque de Sodor-et-Man. Traduit de l'Anglais par le Rév. J. MUDRY, Ministre de l'Eglise Protest. Episc. Franç. de Lond. Londres : Imprimé aux frais de la Société pour la Propagation des Connaissances Chrétiennes ; et se trouve au Répertoire, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, et au No. 4, Royal Exchange ; et chez tous les Libraires.

2. *Corruptions de l'Eglise de Rome, par rapport au gouvernement ecclésiastique, aux Articles de la Foi, et à la Forme du culte divin : en réponse aux questions de l'Evêque de Meaux.* Par le Très-Rév. GEORGE BULL, D.D. Evêque de St. David. Avec une Préface et des Notes, par le Rév. M. THO. P. PANTIN, M.A. Recteur de Westcote, Comté de Gloucester. Traduit de l'Anglais, et avec une notice sur la vie et les écrits de l'auteur, par le Rév. J. MUDRY, Ministre de l'Eglise Protest. Episcop. Franç. de Londres. Londres : Imprimé aux frais de la Société pour la Propagation des Connaissances Chrétiennes ; et se trouve au Répertoire, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, et No. 4, Royal Exchange ; et chez tous les Libraires.

3. *La Liturgie, ou le Livre des Prières Publiques, et de l'Administration des Sacrements, &c. &c. &c. selon le Rite de l'Eglise Anglicane : contenant en outre le Psautier, ou les Psaumes de David, avec les repos, marqués pour le chant ou la récitation dans l'Eglise ; et ensuite les Offices pour l'Ordination des Diacones et des Prêtres, ainsi que pour le Sacre des Evêques, &c. &c. &c.*
NO. CXVII.—N.S.

Londres : Imprimé aux frais de la Société pour la Propagation des Connaissances Chrésiennes.

WE purchased copies of the above works, of two of them at least, for the purpose of giving them away. After casting a glance at them, however, we decided upon reviewing them. They are not such works as one can safely put into the hands of an educated Frenchman; they are not such works as ought ever to have been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, considering the high position and character which this Society holds, and its many services to the Church.

We originally intended prefacing our criticisms on these three books by a few observations on what, according to our view, constitutes the chief characteristics of a good translation, illustrating our remarks at the same time by extracts from different translations in different languages; but, after inspecting the versions before us, we soon perceived how such observations, even if want of room did not forbid it, would be out of place in the present paper. With such translations as we have to examine, a short dissertation on the analytical structure of language, or rather on orthography, syntax, and prosody, would be far more appropriate.

French translations may be divided into four categories. There is, in the first place, the close, and, at the same time, free, vigorous, and idiomatic translation, removed alike, as Cowper says in his preface to 'Homer,' 'from stiffness and from wildness,' and of which specimens may be found in Chateaubriand, Guizot, and Villemain, and, we may add, in many of the works of the Anglo-Continental Society. This is the perfect translation. Again, there is the absolutely free and licentious translation, which is exemplified in La Bédollière's version of the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' and in Bonnet's 'Leighton on S. Peter.' Thirdly, there is the falsified and dishonest translation, in which authors are made to say not only what they do not, but the very contradictory of what they do say, and of which we have frequent samples in the *Partie officielle* of the *Moniteur*, and in the famous ultramontanist version of Ranke's 'History of the Popes.' Lastly, there is the clumsy, slovenly, unartistic, ungrammatical translation, full of *tournures embrouillées*, cacologies, and barbarisms, picked up we know not where, but certainly not within the precincts of the French Institute, and of which we have numberless specimens in the books mentioned at the head of this article. This translation is very peculiar; and in offering some remarks upon it, we are desirous, where possible, to dissociate the Society from M. Mudry, the author whom it has been unfortunate enough to employ.

We proceed at once to give specimens of this last species of translation, beginning with the 'Wilson.' This version does not

seem to be made from the authentic edition of Wilson's work, but from the Society's own mutilated reprint of it, which, in spite of repeated remonstrances public and private, continues to be palmed upon the world, and which, in some respects, bears the same resemblance to the genuine 'Wilson,' which M. Mudry's French bears, in all respects, to that of a Nodier or a Villemain. Of course the Epistle Dedicatory is omitted. This is perhaps a fortunate circumstance for M. Mudry. We doubt whether his translation would have proved a great acquisition to French literature.

M. Mudry stumbles at the very threshold. We have given in full the title-page of the French 'Wilson' at the head of this paper, taking scrupulous care not even to omit the translator's name and title; and, as our readers will have perceived, with its 'avis et instructions, convenables pour y prendre part d'une manière judicieuse et profitable,' with its 'Répertoire,' and its incorrect accentuation and punctuation, it is very clumsily put together. The 'Table des divers Articles' which follows, and which is a translation of 'The Contents,' comprises also several blunders, to say nothing of the misprints. Thus M. Mudry speaks of a 'Courte méthode pour parvenir,' instead of 'Méthode à suivre pour parvenir;' of 'Sur le bon propos à former, de mener une vie nouvelle,' instead of 'De la ferme résolution de mener,' &c.; of 'pratiques de Dévotion à exercer,' instead of 'auxquelles on devra se livrer.' We shall place in parallel columns the English of the two first paragraphs in the first section of the Bishop's work, and M. Mudry's translation:—

'There are two holy Ordinances, or Sacraments, appointed by Jesus Christ as most especial means of obtaining grace and salvation; which no Christian who hopes to be saved must wilfully neglect. These are Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

'It must be supposed that you have already been made partakers of one of these two Sacraments: viz. that of Baptism, by which you were admitted into the congregation of Christ's flock, were restored to the favour of God, and had the Holy Spirit communicated to you, for a principle of a new and spiritual life; in order to awaken you, and to direct and assist that natural reason, with which God has endued all mankind.'

'Jésus-Christ institué deux Saintes Ordonnances ou deux Sacraments, comme des moyens très-spécialement établis pour nous obtenir la grâce de Dieu et le salut éternel; ainsi nulle personne qui desire se sauver, ne peut se permettre d'en négliger volontairement les secours. Ce sont le Baptême et la Sainte Cène.

'Il est à supposer que vous avez déjà participé à l'un de ces deux Sacraments: c'est-à-dire, à celui du Baptême, par lequel vous avez été reçu dans la congrégation du troupeau de Christ,—remis en grâce auprès de Dieu,—et enrichi de la communication du Saint Esprit: ce qui doit être pour vous le principe d'une vie spirituelle, toute nouvelle, vous aider à vous réveiller du sommeil; et servir en vous de guide et d'appui à cette raison naturelle dont Dieu s'est plu de donner tout le genre humain.'—P. 1.

The construction of both these paragraphs is vicious, and

the punctuation, like everything else, quite *sui generis*; but they also contain bad grammar and nonsense. '*Congrégation du troupeau de Christ*'! '*S'est plu de douer*'! '*Désire se sauver*'—that is, wishes to *run away*! Il semblerait que le Chrétien de M. Mudry ne songe qu'à s'enfuir! The reader will perceive there is no expression in the English to give even a colour to the translator's amusing blunder.

Without professing to be first-rate French scholars, we think we can translate at least as well as M. Mudry. We venture to give our own translation, or rather to correct his:—Jésus-Christ a établi deux saintes institutions ou deux Sacrements, qu'il nous a laissés comme des moyens très-spéciaux, destinés à nous obtenir la grâce de Dieu et le salut éternel, et qu'aucun Chrétien qui espère être sauvé ne doit volontairement négliger. Ces Sacrements sont le Baptême et la sainte Cène.

Il est à supposer que vous avez déjà participé à l'un de ces deux Sacrements, c'est-à-dire à celui du Baptême, par lequel vous avez été fait membre du troupeau de Jésus-Christ, remis en grâce auprès de Dieu, et doué du Saint-Esprit, afin qu'il fût en vous le principe d'une vie nouvelle et spirituelle, qu'il vous tirât du sommeil, dirigeât et assistât en vous cette raison naturelle que Dieu a donnée à tous les hommes.

The two next sentences in M. Mudry's translation are not much better French than the two preceding, but we pass them over, and come to the following paragraph:—

'For if you go to the Lord's Supper without considering the reason of that ordinance, and the very great concern you have in it; without seeing the necessity and blessing of a Redeemer; you will go with indifference, and return without such benefit as you might otherwise hope for.'

'Mais si vous *alliez* recevoir la Sainte Cène sans considérer les motifs de cette sainte institution et la grande part que vous y avez—sans voir la nécessité d'un Rédempteur et le bienfait de la rédemption; vous *iriez* avec indifférence, et vous reviendriez sans ces avantages que vous en auriez pu espérer avec de meilleures dispositions.'—P. 2.

We will offer no comment on the undeniable beauties we have italicised in the above, but will again take the liberty of subjoining our own version:—Car si vous participez à la sainte Cène sans être pénétrés des raisons pour lesquelles ce Sacrement a été institué, et de l'intérêt suprême dont il est pour vous; sans concevoir la nécessité d'un Rédempteur ni reconnaître le bienfait de la rédemption, vous recevrez ce Sacrement avec indifférence, et ensuite vous vous retirerez de la Sainte Table, sans y avoir trouvé ces avantages spirituels que vous eussiez pu en espérer, avec de meilleures dispositions.

Perhaps the above complete sentences will be considered sufficient as specimens of the translator's powers. We must, however, give a few isolated expressions. Immediately after

the above, we have 'retrés en grâce avec Dieu' (p. 3), instead of 'auprès de Dieu'; 'ce qu'ils voyaient juste et droit' (ibid.), instead of 'ce qu'ils jugeaient juste et droit'; 'ainsi que l'Écriture nous en informe' (p. 4), instead of 'nous le dit'; 'ne vivre que pour contracter de mauvaises habitudes' (p. 5), instead of 'pour se livrer à'; 'Dieu avait pourvu dans sa bonté' (ibid.), instead of 'préparé'; 'il a même envoyé son bien-aimé Fils se revêtir' (p. 8), instead of 'afin qu'il se revêtît'; 'ce fut avec cette promesse' (ibid.), instead of 'au moyen de cette promesse'; 'comme il a déjà été observé' (p. 9), instead of 'comme on l'a déjà fait observer'; 'horriblement affreuse' (p. 10)—we need hardly say that there is no equivalent in the original for this delectable trash, which forcibly reminds one of—

'J'aime superbement et magnifiquement :
Ces deux adverbes joints font admirablement'—

'horriblement affreuse,' instead of 'horriblement cruelle'; 'profonde calamité' (ibid.), instead of 'grande calamité'; 'ils tâchent de suivre les règles qu'il leur a prescrites, et qui leur sont absolument nécessaires pour les mettre en état d'entrer dans le ciel et y jouir du bonheur' (pp. 10, 11), instead of 'pour qu'ils puissent être capables d'entrer dans le ciel, et d'y jouir de la félicité.' Many more similar expressions are to be met with in this section, and, indeed, in all the sections, but the above will amply suffice to give an idea of the knowledge of French and philological acquirements of our somewhat adventurous translator. We have passed over many mistakes, *et des plus belles!* In fact, throughout the book, from beginning to end—

'On n'y saurait marcher que sur de belles choses.
Ce sont petits chemins tout parsemés de roses.'

One additional specimen of these *belles choses* we cannot, however, resist the temptation of giving. It is taken from the end of the first section, and admirably illustrates M. Mudry's competency for the task of translator of Bishop Wilson, or of any one else. We will once more place the original and the translation, or caricature rather, side by side:—

'But instead of that, He has been graciously pleased to accept of our sincere though imperfect obedience, and of our sincere repentance, when we have done amiss, and return to our duty.

'Consider this seriously: and you cannot but express your thankfulness after some such manner as this'—

'Mais au lieu de cela, il s'est plu dans sa miséricorde d'accepter de notre part une sincère quoiqu'imparfaite obéissance, et une sincère quoiqu'imparfaite repentance, toutes les fois qu'après être tombés [tombés où ?], nous rentrons dans le devoir.

'Considérez ceci sérieusement: et vous ne pourrez vous empêcher d'exprimer, en quelque sorte, votre reconnaissance de la manière suivante'—

'S'est plu de!' 'Sincère quoiqu'imparfaite obéissance!' 'Considérez ceci!' 'Vous ne pourrez vous empêcher d'exprimer, en quelque sorte!' &c. &c. What fidelity to the English! and what French! Mais c'est du galimatias tout pur! We will once more take the liberty of subjoining another translation:—Mais, au lieu de cela, il a daigné dans sa grande miséricorde accepter notre obéissance sincère quoique imparfaite, et notre repentir véritable, toutes les fois qu'après avoir péché nous rentrons dans le devoir. Considérez sérieusement ces choses, et vous ne pourrez vous empêcher de lui exprimer votre reconnaissance dans les termes suivants ou d'après toute autre formule équivalente.

Our accomplished translator, as the reader has noticed, has a special predilection for 's'est plu de.' The expression again occurs at p. 9. 'Notre Dieu s'est plu dans sa miséricorde d'envoyer.' He is also remarkably fond of the word *diable*, which, without wishing in any way to appear hypercritical or pedantic, we beg to inform M. Mudry, is excessively *familier*, if not positively vulgar. *Démon* is the word ordinarily used. But the whole translation is bald, *lâche*, hazy, un-French, 'horriblement affreuse,' in short; it is full of solecisms and barbarisms, and it is much to be regretted that an institution which in so many ways fairly represents the Church of England as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has been made responsible for it. Throughout, the punctuation is most faulty; throughout, there is scarcely one well-constructed sentence; throughout, it is full of expressions altogether proscribed *par le bon goût*; and as to the actual grammatical blunders, they are as

'Thick as leaves that strew the vales
In Vallombrosa.'

Perhaps it will be said that provided the *fond* of a book is good, the *forme* is a matter of little consideration; that French readers will take up Bishop Wilson's work and read on without stopping to admire the many philological beauties and elegancies scattered in M. Mudry's translation in the most varied profusion; perhaps we may be told, in the language of Martine, whose style, by the way, our translator seems to have taken for model—

'Quand on se fait entendre, on parle toujours bien;
Et tous vos biaux dictons ne servent pas de rien.'

But to this we reply, that it is not always easy to understand M. Mudry; that, whatever may be the intrinsic value of a book, Frenchmen will not read it if it is badly and ungrammatically written; that French taste is extremely fastidious on the score of grammar,¹ exactness, clearness, method, and propriety, and

¹ 'If a French writer of distinction,' says Mr. Breen, in his useful work on *Modern English Literature* (p. 5), 'were to violate any important rule of grammar, the fact

that it is therefore of infinite importance that translations of English works—especially theology, should be put before them in a presentable shape; that the translation before us is not only inelegant, coarse, unintelligible, and essentially corrupt, but also, in some places, irresistibly comic, and that the French have a keen sense of the ludicrous—a sense which we fear would be kept for some time to come in a state of extravagant excitement, should M. Mudry's book unluckily fall into their hands.

'Celui qui ne parle pas clairement,' says the Abbé Mullois, 'ne parle pas Français; car, de sa nature, la langue française est claire, limpide et franche; et la parole obscure n'est vraiment pas une parole française. C'est tudesque, jargon ou patois; mais ce n'est pas la langue du grand peuple franc.'¹

Turn we now to the second book on our list. Like that of its predecessor, its title-page presents some noticeable curiosities; and on it, too, we see announced that it is to be had at the *Répertoire* of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. But, not content with supplying us with a French translation of Bull's 'Corruptions,' the translator has enriched the work with a very remarkable original notice of the Bishop, which is one of the most extraordinary pieces of French composition it has ever been our lot to stumble upon. In this biographical sketch, M. Mudry, whatever may be the case with Bishop Bull, shines with undiminished lustre, or rather with even greater lustre than before. Persons usually compose better than they translate; but this is not the case with our biographer; when compelled to 'shine by his own proper light,' without the thoughts and language of another to guide him, he shines with pre-eminent éclat. We call M. Mudry's biography *French*; but we do so out of pure complaisance and accommodation; it can only be called French on Sganarelle's convenient principle in Molière's 'Médecin malgré lui,' 'Il y a fagots et fagots.' The *Notice sur la Vie et les Ecrits du Docteur G. Bull* is not very long—it only consists of some twenty-five pages; but quantity is compensated by quality, by profound depth and clearness of meaning, and by elaborate elegance of language. We have given our readers specimens of M. Mudry's translations; we will now give them a few extracts, taken, but not selected, from his original compositions. The whole of the *Notice* is a perfect *florilegium*; and our only difficulty is that of deciding upon what to take. We really find ourselves in a veritable *embarras de richesses*.

ἦν γὰρ ἀψωμαί τινος,
τόδ' οὐκ εἰ μὲ, παρακαλεῖ δ' ἐκείθεν αὖ—.

'would be laid hold of immediately by the critics, and laughed at from one end of France to the other.' We know of two or three instances illustrating the truth of this remark. Of course we are not here alluding to M. Mudry.

¹ Cours d'Eloquence Sacrée, p. 144.

We shall therefore begin at the beginning. M. Mudry commences in a very magisterial and self-satisfied way, and with matchless faith in his own powers.

'En plaçant ici une courte notice sur la Vie et les Ecrits du Docteur Bull, je crois donner plus de force à ma traduction, inspirer plus de confiance à mes lecteurs, et rendre un vrai service à ceux d'entre eux, dont ce grand homme n'est pas encore connu. C'est par conséquent le meilleur *passé-port* que je puisse donner à ce petit traité qui est sorti de sa plume, et que j'ai l'honneur d'offrir au public sous les auspices de la langue Française.'—P. 5.

It is evident that the biographer has an inordinately high opinion of his own achievements. We are sorry to disturb his placid self-sufficiency, but we cannot help saying that if he had only written this sentence, it would prove his utter and unrelievable disqualification for the task he has undertaken. We presume that M. Mudry means simply to say that the best recommendation to the 'Corruptions of the Church of Rome' will be an account of the author's life; this is not, however, what his French expresses. He tells us, in the first place, that his translation is deficient in strength—an assertion which we do not feel at all disposed to controvert, but that it will derive strength from the short notice of Bishop Bull prefixed to it—though what his translation has to do with the Bishop's book in the abstract, or with his life, utterly baffles our comprehension. M. Mudry says, in the next place, that, in giving an account of Bishop Bull, he intends to impart more confidence to his readers than they otherwise would have in the work of that great man, and confer a real service upon those to whom the Bishop is unknown! We stand absolutely confounded at the translator's intrepid self-complacency and infatuation. Singular sort of confidence, truly, he is likely to inspire! Surely M. Mudry must be all the while indulging in a little quiet irony, at the expense of Frenchmen! How very admirably calculated M. Mudry's language is to give confidence to Frenchmen, and insensibly and delightfully lead them on to the perusal and study of the work before us! Why, there is not a Frenchman that would not stand aghast at the formidable nonsense so majestically put forth by M. Mudry, and turn away from Bull as he would from the great Sahara. But this is not all. M. Mudry moreover informs us that this notice of his is the best passport he can give to the work before us. Here we quite agree with the biographer. We have no doubt M. Mudry has done his utmost, and that his notice is really the best passport *he* could give. But why give one at all? It is a most happy circumstance that passports are now abolished, otherwise we apprehend that French *douaniers*, on seeing the sort of passport delivered by M. Mudry, would at once stop Bishop Bull, and this although he appeared '*sous les auspices de la langue Française!*'

But to be serious—and it is really a most serious matter—we fervently hope that M. Mudry's translation will never cross the Channel, or fall into the hands of contributors to the *Monde*, *Correspondant*, *Bibliographie Catholique*, or any other ultramontanist periodical. If the laugh were only at M. Mudry we should not care: but unfortunately he has compromised not only the excellent Society, but the Church, of which that Society has so long, and in past years with such faithfulness, been the representative.

We presume that what M. Mudry intended to say was something to the following effect:—Les pages qui suivent offrent la traduction d'un ouvrage important de l'Évêque Bull, écrit en anglais par ce théologien illustre, en réponse à une lettre de Bossuet. En plaçant au début de ce livre une courte notice sur la vie et les travaux du Docteur Bull, je crois donner plus d'intérêt au présent traité, inspirer plus de confiance à mes lecteurs, et rendre un vrai service à ceux d'entre eux qui ne connaissent pas encore ce grand homme. Nul plus que le savant Evêque n'a su accorder sa conduite avec ses principes. Raconter ici sa vie, c'est donc ajouter à son ouvrage la garantie la plus sûre et la meilleure des recommandations. L'auteur et le livre méritent d'être connus en France; c'est là le motif qui m'a déterminé à présenter au public français une traduction des *Corruptions of the Church of Rome*, et à la faire précéder du récit qu'on va lire.

After the above pleasant exordium we have the following sentence, in which the profundity of thought, richness of meaning, and felicity of diction, are all on a par:—

'On saura donc,' continues M. Mudry, 'que George Bull, connu ensuite sous le nom de Dr. Bull et d'Evêque de St. David [*sic*], naquit le 25 mars, 1634, à Wells, dans la paroisse de St. Cuthbert [*sic*], comté de Somerset, où sa famille se soutenait alors par son industrie et tenait encore un rang fort respectable.'—P. 5.

There are here at least as many blunders as there are lines. 'On saura donc' is flat, redundant, and *familier*, and an educated Frenchman would not commence a sentence thus, especially after what goes before. 'Se soutenait alors par son industrie' is a very equivocal mode of gaining a livelihood, and 'tenait encore un rang fort respectable' is nonsense—unless, indeed, the biographer intends to say that Bull's father was a dishonest character, but that he *nevertheless* held a very respectable position in society. 'Se soutenir par son industrie,' as M. Mudry should know, is equivalent to *vivre d'industrie*, which is always taken *en mauvaise part*. But M. Mudry is fond of using grandiloquent expressions, frequently without comprehending their meaning, and it is only fair he should pay the penalty of his rashness and

ignorance. Of course 'vivait de travail et occupait un rang fort respectable' would be too simple for Bull's biographer. We must also ask M. Mudry whether it was at Wells, or in the county of Somerset (it does not appear, according to M. Mudry, that it was actually at Wells), that Bull's family lived, and whether it was, after all, the *père* Bull himself, or his family, 'qui se soutenait alors par *son* industrie.' Both Saint-David and Saint-Cuthbert are likewise misspelt. These compound words should both have the *trait-d'union*.

Passing over the three next sentences, which, in spite of their brevity, contain some very remarkable specimens of condensed original thought and delicacy of language, as well as one or two ideas apparently borrowed from *feu* Monsieur de la Palisse, we come to the following portentous, as well as pretentious *morceau* :—

'C'est ainsi que fut commencé l'édifice de son éducation ; mais ce fut surtout à l'école publique de Tiverton qu'il se mit à donner des indices non équivoques des talens remarquables dont la Providence l'avait doué.'—P. 5.

'Commencer l'édifice d'une éducation' ! Has M. Mudry no sense of the incongruous and ludicrous ? Naturally such a sentence as the following : 'Son éducation commença ainsi ; mais ce fut surtout à l'école publique de Tiverton qu'il donna des preuves non équivoques des talens remarquables dont la Providence l'avait doué,' would again be too simple for such a fine writer as M. Mudry (though, by thus expressing himself, he would have avoided two *futs*, and 'se mit à donner,' which are both bad), and so we must have such concentrated essence of absurdity as 'commencer l'édifice de l'éducation !' But let us proceed. M. Mudry adds—

'Car il en sortit à l'âge de quatorze ans avec la réputation d'un jeune homme d'une grande sobriété, d'une instruction peu commune, et d'une rare facilité pour la composition des vers latins.'—P. 6.

Our biographer seems to delight in repetitions. In his title-page the word *et* occurs seven times ; we have just had three *futs* in four lines ; and now we have one *un* and three *unes* in three lines, as well as the announcement that young Bull had achieved a reputation at the age of fourteen ! We would again venture to substitute our own French for M. Mudry's :—A quatorze ans il sortit de cette école, distingué déjà par sa rare sobriété, son instruction peu commune, et par une extrême facilité pour la composition des vers latins.

Bull's indefatigable biographer *vires acquirit eundo*. He continues :—

'Accompagné de cette excellente recommandation, George Bull se rendit de suite à l'université d'Oxford, et fut honorablement reçu dans "Exeter College," le 10 juillet, 1648 ; où, malgré le penchant qu'il manifesta d'abord pour les

plaisirs et les amusemens de son âge, il finit *pourtant* par devenir un logicien de quelque mérite, et par *se* gagner les bonnes grâces de ses supérieurs.'—P. 6.

'Accompagné de cette excellente recommandation' is again sheer nonsense; M. Mudry ought to have said, 'Muni d'excellents témoignages,' or something of the sort. His *de suite* is also very remarkable. As to the precise signification which M. Mudry attaches here to the word '*pourtant*,' it is quite beyond us. Does he really mean to say that there is any sort of incompatibility between the love of innocent recreation, or, we might add, any sort of recreation, and a logical mind? We fear that M. Mudry's own logic is not superior to his grammar.

In the next sentence M. Mudry delivers himself of the following brilliant piece of imagery:—

'Mais c'étaient alors des jours mauvais pour l'Angleterre! et George Bull, *quoiqu'encore* [how euphonious!] si jeune, ayant refusé, avec tant d'autres de prêter [?] le serment de fidélité au pouvoir qui s'était installé dans le pays par l'échafaud de Charles I., se vit forcé de quitter Oxford avant la fin de 1649.'—P. 6.

The beginning of this passage is very flat again, and un-French. M. Mudry ought to have said, 'Mais l'Angleterre avait alors à traverser des jours mauvais.' Towards the end, M. Mudry adopts once more the grandiloquent style, and, in doing so, talks again, of course, rank and unmitigated rubbish. *Installer un pouvoir par l'échafaud!!* This is an idea which, we believe, had never before entered anybody's head; but then M. Mudry is a very original thinker and writer also, and possesses marvellous powers of conception, as well as of illustration.

We are next informed that young Bull prosecuted his studies under the Rector of Ubley, and that his 'caractère prit cet air de gravité qu'il a toujours retenu dans la suite,' which means, that he never forgot the grave tune—for that is the only possible meaning of *retenir un air*—which he was taught by the Puritan Rector! Might we be allowed to ask M. Mudry what tune that was? Is it possible, once again, that such ludicrous absurdities should be sanctioned and put forth by the Christian Knowledge Society?

Besides learning a tune, according to M. Mudry, young Bull seems, according to the same authority, to have done something more. Let M. Mudry again speak, with his own exact delicacy of phrase and exquisite perception:—

'D'ailleurs il sut si bien profiter des conseils de ses vrais amis, et des moyens qu'il avait de s'instruire, qu'il eut bientôt amplement réparé tout le temps qu'il pouvait avoir perdu précédemment; et il faut ajouter [*sic*] qu'il s'était principalement occupé de la théologie et de l'histoire ecclésiastique.'—P. 6.

The ideas, the way in which they are expressed, the logic, the orthography, the syntax—all, again, is on a par. What *can* M. Mudry possibly mean? This is one of the most dismal sen-

tences we have ever read. The language may be 'tudesque, jargon ou patois;' but it certainly is not the 'langue du grand peuple franc.'

What young Bull did after he had completed his studies, the biographer shall himself once more tell us in his own peculiar phraseology:—

'Ayant enfin achevé ses études, George Bull se ressouvint des vœux qu'avait exprimés son père *avant de mourir*; et consultant son propre cœur, IL FUT PERSUADÉ que sa vocation était de les accomplir, et d'entrer *sans délai* [*sic*], dans l'état ecclésiastique. Mais il avait assez bien profité de ses lectures théologiques pour ne pas pouvoir se contenter d'un mission presbytérienne, aussi long temps qu'il ne lui était pas impossible de faire autrement.'—Pp. 6, 7.

M. Mudry is determined to copy Monsieur de la Palisse, and to play the part of Martine to the end.

'De pas mis avec rien tu fais la récidive,
Et c'est, comme on t'a dit, trop d'une négative.'

What could be easier than to write the last sentence thus?—Mais il avait trop profité de ses études théologiques, pour pouvoir se contenter des ordres presbytériens, tant qu'il lui serait possible de recevoir des ordres légitimes.

But enough of this. 'Il y a des absurdités,' says Souvestre, 'devant lesquelles l'esprit s'arrête comme devant l'infini.' Here we ourselves shall stop, for *décidément nous nous y perdons*; and indeed we believe our readers have had quite enough of M. Mudry's picturesque *charabia*. Besides, to notice all the mistakes and blunders contained in the book before us would require a whole number of this periodical. We shall, therefore, at once terminate our extracts from M. Mudry's compositions. We have only examined two pages, and even less, of the 'Life of Bull;' but the remainder of it, and the translation which follows, are not at all better. In the next two or three pages we meet with such things as the following:—'*Réalisé* toute la bonne opinion'; '*présrit*'; '*prenait* une peine particulière à bien enseigner,' &c. &c. '*fonds* baptismaux'; '*à sommer* les pécheurs à la repentance'; '*il est dit*'; 'Grand-Chancelier d'Angleterre'; '*demeura* Recteur'; '*qui étaient* à chanceler'; '*obtenir* la réputation d'un orateur brillant'; '*connaissant* à un haut degré l'Hébreu'; '*avaient coûté*'; '*parut* sur la scène du monde comme un auteur'; '*faire* une figure préminente,' &c. &c. &c. There is not a sentence, hardly a line, in this *rudis indigestaque moles*, which does not contain some incongruity in the images (M. Mudry is very fond of imagery), some grotesqueness or absurdity in the sentiment, some impropriety or blunder in the language; frequently we find all these defects combined *dans une magnifique unité*. It is really astonishing how M. Mudry

can contrive to accumulate impropriety upon impropriety, mistake upon mistake, blunder upon blunder. Provincialisms, wordiness, discordant epithets, incoherent and unintelligible crudities, faults of orthography, accentuation, punctuation, and grammar generally—not to speak of the unacknowledged appropriations from La Palisse—follow each other in most rapid and edifying succession ;

‘ Et les moindres défauts de ce *hardi génie*
Sont ou le pléonasme, ou la cacophonie.’

The publication of a work of this nature can be of no use to those into whose hands it is likely to fall ; they would not read a page of it without being frightened out of all propriety, or laughing heartily. In conception, sentiment, and language, it is the very worst piece of biography we have ever read ; and yet we must be gravely told that this very attractive composition is intended to serve as a passport to poor Bishop Bull, and to give confidence to French readers !

We may possibly, for expressing this opinion of M. Mudry's book, be accused of not possessing a very keen and discerning sympathy with the lofty aspirations of genius, or even of a settled purpose, *per fas et nefas*, to depreciate that gentleman's interesting labours ; but we beg to say we have not set down aught in malice, and that we have rather extenuated than exaggerated his defects. There is no Society which is better enabled than the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to publish a good translation of Bull's ‘Corruptions ;’ and there is, we believe, no Society which would venture to put forth the thing we have been briefly examining. It is not only very discreditable, but very injurious and culpable ; it is a high crime and misdemeanour against English theology generally and Bishop Bull in particular, as well as against the French language. We hear people frequently speaking of the ‘humble task’ of translators, and so forth : it may be an humble task, but it is a very difficult one, requiring a combination of several qualifications not often united in the same person ; and the difficulty of the task is incontrovertibly demonstrated by the paucity of really good translations. People may differ, as Marmontel tells us they do, as to what actually constitutes a good translation ; but all those who have spoken or written on the subject must at any rate be agreed on this point, viz. that a person should at least possess an ordinary acquaintance with the language into which he professes to translate. The two first works mentioned at the head of this paper show that this is not always the case. We trust these are the last translations we shall see from

M. Mudry's pen. The task appears to us beyond his strength, and in undertaking it he wanders from his legitimate province. There is scarcely a sentence of his which does not indicate his unfitness for the duties of French translator; the printing of such works as the two specimens before us appears to us a deplorable waste of money; and their circulation may be attended with very injurious consequences to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and to the Church.

We now come to the French Prayer-Book. In a memorandum addressed to the Standing Committee by the Foreign Translation Committee, dated November, 1860, and printed in the Society's Report for 1861 (p. 95), we meet with the following singular account of it:—

'In 1835, the Bishop of Winchester represented that *the* French version of the Liturgy in use in the Channel Islands may be safely adopted with certain corrections. In 1839 a revision of this Liturgy was undertaken, but it was expressly stated that it was not intended for Guernsey or Jersey (each of these islands having a Version of its own), but for use in England, and *for circulation in France* and in British Colonies. An edition was published in 1842, and in 1846 (? 1845) an edition which had been subject to still further revision, and has since been frequently reprinted.'

This is a strange and clumsily worded paragraph. It contains, also, some mistakes as to actual matters of fact, and a palpably self-contradictory statement; for if Jersey and Guernsey—to say nothing of Alderney and Sark—have each a version of their own (as we are informed they have), it is rather difficult to understand by what process the Bishop of Winchester could possibly manage to represent that *the* French version of the Liturgy in use in 'the Channel Islands may be safely adopted with certain corrections.' . . . But we pass on to more important matters. It may appear an indiscreet and bold proceeding to set oneself against the Bishop of Winchester, but, in spite of the respect which is due to his so formally expressed opinion on the matter, we feel that we must join issue with his lordship. How far, before recommending 'the safe adoption,' 'with certain corrections,' of 'the French 'version of the Liturgy in use in the Channel Islands,' the Bishop had carefully and anxiously examined the whole of the book, was perfectly acquainted with its contents, and had considered all the advantages and disadvantages of the measure, we are not told; but that does not prevent us from recording our own deliberate conviction that, in adopting the course recommended by Dr. Sumner, the Society acted very unwisely. 'The French version of the Liturgy in use in the Channel Islands,' in 1835, 'with certain corrections!' It does not appear that the Bishop informed the Society what the nature of these 'certain

corrections' was to be, and, in the absence of any actual *data*, we will not attempt to solve the mystery. Anyhow, when it is known to what the French Prayer-Book in question had been reduced, it must be confessed that the Bishop was not very exacting. The Prefaces, Tables, and Ordination Services had been altogether expunged; *Ministre* in most places had been substituted for *Prêtre*; the most unwarrantable changes had been introduced into many of the Rubrics, which in some places had become, in consequence, self-contradictory and nonsensical, while other Rubrics had been ruthlessly suppressed; the most flagitious tampering with the language of some of the prayers, frequently involving serious doctrinal obliquities, had been indulged in; some of the Offices had been transposed; and the work, generally, mutilated, disfigured, abridged, falsified, and puritanised to an extent that would satisfy Lord Ebury and the most rabid and thorough-paced Liturgical reformers of the present time—nay, that, since 1835, has appeared to satisfy even the Bishop of Winchester himself! 'Certain corrections!' But the greater portion of the book, especially if intended 'for circulation in France,' should have been translated anew. Indeed, we perceive that the Society has given what appears very much like a new translation of some parts: such, for instance, as the Psalms, of which the French is excellent, and the Epistles and Gospels (taken, apparently, from a modernised edition of Martin); and we very much regret that, instead of subjecting the book to periodical patchings and revisions, it should not originally have declined acting on the Bishop of Winchester's 'representation,' and had the whole work retranslated by competent persons. Not that we have any fault to find with the actual revisions. We have compared some of the last editions with the first ones, and find a decided improvement. The book has been revised, and revised for the better; but we must add that the improvements are infinitesimally small, and by no means commensurate with the necessities of the case; that the work is in great want of additional and most extensive revision; that it is yet by no means adapted for 'circulation in France;' that it contains much that is feeble, inadequate, bald, inconsistent, clumsy, trivial, fantastic, ungrammatical, absurd, and that is not to be found in the original; and that, in many places, the French bears the same relation to the English that oil of vitriol does to oil of olives.

We have adverted to M. Mudry's remarkable title-pages; that of the Prayer-Book before us deserves a passing notice. What is the meaning of the six *et cæteras* found there? We would look in vain, we believe, into any English Prayer-Book for anything of the sort. What do they stand for? Such a way

of rendering the English title is a gross violation of the most elementary principles of translation, and *et cæteras* are a species of embellishment we have never noticed in any other translation of the Book of Common Prayer. Is it that the English title is untranslatable? But we have often seen it translated correctly enough—it is excellently translated in a new edition of the French Prayer-Book recently printed at the Oxford University Press, and generally adopted, if we mistake not, in the Channel Islands. Andrew Marvell has well defined some of the duties of a translator, and we would venture to commend his words to those who are responsible for the French translations of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge:—

'He is translation's thief that addeth more,
As much as he that taketh from the store
Of the first author. Here he maketh blots;
That mends; and added beauties are but spots.'

Not that we should indulge in such Utopian dreams as to expect to find positive 'beauties,' borrowed or otherwise, from the Society's French editors; but we have, at least, a right to demand that the Society shall translate the English Prayer-Book (if it undertakes the task at all) in its integrity, and that it shall give us a *bonâ fide* version of the original, without addition or subtraction, and certainly without *et cæteras*.

We will give, by way of illustration, a few specimens of the mistakes and blunders to be met with in this book, adding, in order to facilitate reference, the pages where they are to be found, as well as the emendations we should propose. These mistakes can be numbered by the thousands, and may be ranged under three distinct heads:—1. Omissions; 2. Incorrect renderings; 3. Bad grammar. Sometimes, however, it happens, that all these mistakes, as in M. Mudry's translations, are skilfully combined in the same passage. We use the last edition, published in 1859:—

'Pourquoi quelques unes ont été
abolies et d'autres retenues.'—P. iii.
'Dans leurs demandes.'—P. vi.
'Que pour un bon but.'—P. vii.
'Que nous aurions dû ne pas faire.'
—P. 3.
'Prêtre.'—P. 5, et *passim*.
'Alors se lira de même.'—P. 11.
'Le Prince Consort.'—*Passim*.
'Diable.'—P. 34, et *passim*.
'Au milieu de ton Eglise.'—P. 39.
'Les Evêques et LES (!!) Pasteurs
de ton troupeau.'—P. 44.

Pourquoi quelques-unes ont été
abolies et d'autres conservées.
Dans ses demandes.
Qu'en vue d'un but excellent.
Que nous n'aurions pas dû faire.

Le Prêtre.
Alors on lira de même.
Le Prince Epoux.
Démon.
Au milieu de ta sainte Eglise.
Les Evêques et Pasteurs de ton
troupeau.

'Promus à quelque fonction sacrée.'
—*Ibid.*

'Après l'une ou l'autre.'—P. 45.

'A l'édification de ton Eglise.'—*Ibid.*

'Tettent.'—P. 64.

'Dans toutes nos nécessités.'—
P. 76.

'Des dons du Saint-Esprit.'—
P. 231.

'Pourvu pour cet objet.'—P. 260.

'Quand il y aura Communion, le
Prêtre mettra sur la Table.'—*Ibid.*

'Il est très-raisonnable, il est très-
juste.'—P. 270.

'Sang précieux.'—P. 273.

'Après l'avoir eu instituée.'—*Ibid.*

'De ce que nous sommes maintenant
vrais membres.'—P. 276.

'Il est d'usage qu'ils communient
tous les Dimanches.'—P. 280.

'Alors chaque paroissien.'—*Ibid.*

'Ce serait une vraie idolâtrie.'

'Il implique contradiction, qu'ils se
trouvent en plus d'un lieu à la fois.'—
P. 281.

'Remplis d'eau pure.'—P. 282.

'Qu'il soit reçu dans l'Eglise de
Jésus-Christ, et qu'il en devienne un
véritable membre.'—*Ibid.*

'Fidèles et chers [!] enfants.'—Pp.
285, 294.

'Selon l'ordre prescrit par l'Eglise.'—
P. 288.

'Ce formulaire.'—P. 290.

'Commodément auprès des Fonts.'—
P. 294.

'Institué de Dieu.'—P. 303.

'Le Prêtre, allant à la rencontre du
Corps jusqu'à l'entrée du Cimetière,
dira ou chantera avec les clercs.'—
P. 317.

'Ne fait point de bon fruit.'—P. 325.

'Ces divers Ordres parmi ceux qui
en sont les Ministres.'—P. 539.

'Et ces Dignités ont toujours été
tenues dans la plus haute Estime et
la plus haute Vénération, afin que
personne ne pût s'ingérer à en exercer
la moindre des fonctions . . . et sans
être connu pour en avoir les qualités
requises, sans même avoir été ap-
prouvé, et ensuite avoir été admis par
l'Autorité légitime.'—*Ibid.*

NO. CXVII.—N.S.

Admis à quelque fonction sacrée.

Après l'une quelconque.

A l'avantage de ta sainte Eglise.

Sont à la mamelle.

Dans tous nos dangers et dans toutes
nos nécessités.

Des dons spéciaux du Saint-Esprit.

Fourni pour cet objet.

A CE MOMENT, quand il y aura
Communion, le Prêtre mettra sur la
Table.

Il est véritablement raisonnable, il
est véritablement juste.

Sang très-précieux.

Après l'avoir instituée.

De ce que nous sommes membres
véritables.

Il communieront tous ensemble
avec le Prêtre chaque Dimanche au
moins.

Et tous les ans à Pâques, chaque
paroissien.

Ce serait une idolâtrie.

Et c'est une chose contraire à la
vérité du Corps naturel de Jésus-Christ,
que d'être en plus d'un lieu à la fois.

Qui seront alors remplis d'eau pure.

Qu'il soit reçu dans la sainte Eglise
de Jésus-Christ, et qu'il en devienne
membre vivant.

Enfants fidèles et élus.

Selon l'ordre légitime prescrit par
l'Eglise.

Cette formule.

Commodément auprès des Fonts,
selon qu'il le jugera convenable.

Institué par Dieu.

Le Prêtre et les Clercs, après avoir
été au-devant du Corps jusqu'à l'entrée
du Cimetière, et le précédant, diront
ou chanteront.

Ne produit point de bon fruit.

Ces divers Ordres de Ministres.

Et ces dignités ont toujours été
regardées avec une telle estime et une
telle vénération, que nul homme ne
pouvait se permettre d'en exercer la
moindre des fonctions . . . et sans
être reconnu posséder les qualités re-
quises, et aussi sans avoir été approuvé
et ensuite admis par l'autorité légitime.

'Personne ne sera admis à l'Ordre du Diaconat qu'à l'âge de vingt-trois ans [!!!], si ce n'est qu'il n'en ait obtenu la Dispense. Nul ne sera ordonné Prêtre, qu'à vingt-quatre ans [!!!].—*Ibid.*

'Prenez garde que les personnes.'—P. 540.

'Convoitez d'un gain déshonnête.'—P. 544.

'De qui.'—P. 545.

'Reçois le pouvoir.'—P. 546.

'Ensuite l'Evêque lira l'Office de la Communion.'—P. 546.

'Jusqu'à ce qu'elle se soit disculpée du Crime, ou de l'Empêchement.'—P. 547. [Se disculper d'un empêchement !!]

'Au Saint Etat auquel.'—P. 550.

'Auront à recevoir.'—P. 554.

'Passera ensuite au Service de la Communion.'—Pp. 554, 561.

'Administre l'ordre du Diaconat.'—P. 555.

'Recevront l'Ordre de Diaconat.'—*Ibid.*

'Donné plusieurs dons.'—*Ibid.*

'A l'édification de ton Eglise.'—P. 558.

'Avant de vous agréer à cette Administration.'—*Ibid.*

'Non pour la destruction, mais pour l'édification.'—P. 560.

'Articles de Foi.'—P. 568 et passim.

Personne ne sera admis à l'Ordre du Diaconat avant l'âge de vingt-trois ans, à moins d'avoir obtenu une Dispense. Nul ne sera ordonné Prêtre avant l'âge de vingt-quatre ans.

Prenez soin que les personnes.

Avides d'un gain déshonnête.

Desquels.

Reçois l'autorité.

Ensuite l'Evêque continuera l'Office de la Communion.

Jusqu'à ce qu'elle se soit disculpée du crime, ou qu'elle ait écarté l'empêchement.

Aux saintes fonctions auxquelles.

Devront recevoir.

Continuera ensuite le Service de la Communion.

Confère l'ordre du Diaconat.

Seront admis à l'Ordre du Diaconat.

Fait plusieurs dons.

A l'édification et au bon gouvernement de ton Eglise.

Avant de vous admettre à ces Fonctions.

Non pour la destruction, mais pour le salut.

Articles de Religion.

The above specimens are taken, for the most part, at haphazard, and could be multiplied *ad infinitum*; but we fear we have already exceeded our limits. Moreover, we do not profess *de faire une critique à fond*. It will perhaps be urged that it is easy to find mistakes in all translations; that, as Destouches says,

'La critique est aisée, et l'art est difficile;'

and that frequently it is a matter of opinion as to what really is a good translation. But there can only be one opinion in regard to the translation before us: frequently it is not a translation, but a mistranslation; and as to the facility with which mistakes can be found in translations, we fear that, as regards the Society's French Prayer-Book, the difficulty would be not to find them. As we have said, it often happens that the Society does not translate at all, and still oftener that the translation is crude, ungrammatical, and absurd. What will be said to the following, both as a translation and as a piece of

French? 'Etes-vous convaincus que c'est par un mouvement du Saint-Esprit que vous vous engagez dans ce Ministère et dans cet Emploi?'—(P. 545.) What will be said to the following piece of verse?—

'Des joies du Ciel, du bonheur de la Vie,
De tous les biens, source unique, infinie.'—P. 552.

Doubtless some of the expressions adduced in the above list are simple mistranslations, and are not of very great consequence, but they are mistranslations nevertheless; most of them, however, are gross and palpable blunders, and are of immense importance. There are also many whole sentences, and even paragraphs, as well as isolated passages, scattered with somewhat exuberant and unnatural prodigality in different parts of the book, especially in the Preface, the Rubrics, the Communion, and Occasional Services generally, and the Ordinal, of which the construction is hopelessly and radically vicious. It would be useless to point out special blunders; *ce sont toutes phrases à refaire*. The work is also replete with mistakes of another character, which indicate great carelessness and slovenliness—but possibly they did not come under the category of the 'certain corrections' that were requisite. Over and over again the very same words, for no reason that we can divine, are translated in different ways. For instance, in the Office for the Burial of the Dead, at page 320, we read, 'Afin qu'il soit rendu conforme à son corps glorieux, selon l'efficace par laquelle il peut même s'assujettir toutes choses;' but, at page 538, this is transformed into 'afin qu'il devienne conforme à son corps glorieux, selon le pouvoir qu'il a de s'assujettir toutes choses.' 'Lord, hear our prayer,' or 'prayers,' which occurs in the Versicles, in the Order for Confirmation and following offices, is variously translated, 'Seigneur, exauce notre prière,' 'écoute notre prière,' 'écoute notre requête;' while 'trust in Thee' is also rendered 'confiance en toi,' and 'espérance en toi.' If we have reckoned rightly, the formula, or its equivalent, 'who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end,' is translated in seven different ways. In one place we have 'Fête de S. Simon et S. Jude;' in another, 'Fête de S. Simon et de S. Jude,' which is a very different thing. Most wretched also, throughout, is the punctuation. The commencement of the *Jubilate* is printed correctly enough, 'Vous, tous les habitants,' &c. The *Benedicite*, on the contrary, begins thus: 'Vous toutes les œuvres du Seigneur,' and so on to the end. Of course there should be a comma after the 'Vous,' as also between the 'nous,' and the 'misérables pécheurs,' occurring in the Litany. Sometimes we find, at the end of a prayer, 'par Jésus-Christ notre Seigneur,' though

generally, 'par Jésus-Christ, notre Seigneur.' Thus, again, most of the prayers are made to terminate in this way—', par Jésus-Christ notre Seigneur.' The '*par*' should be preceded by a semicolon. In French *Paroissiens*, 'Par Jésus-Christ' constitutes a sentence of itself. In accordance with this peculiar mode of punctuation, we find several prayers, such, for instance, as the General Thanksgiving, terminating thus—', par Jésus-Christ notre Seigneur; à qui, comme à toi et au Saint-Esprit, 'soient tout honneur et toute gloire, aux siècles des siècles.' In the Morning and Evening Services, and elsewhere, the Lord's Prayer commences in the following way: 'Notre Père, qui es aux Cieux. Ton Nom soit sanctifié,' and in the occasional offices thus: 'Notre Père, qui es aux cieux, ton Nom soit sanctifié,' which is the correct way. At page 266, we meet with the following extraordinary specimen of punctuation: 'Nous mangeons et nous buvons notre propre jugement; ne discernant' [an incorrect expression] point le Corps du Seigneur; nous 'allumons,' &c. If we are not mistaken, this blunder has been perpetrated in every edition of the French Prayer-Book published by the Society; we have seen it in three at least. In one or two places, *Let us pray* is not translated at all, and *Amen* is incorrectly printed. 'De telle sorte' frequently occurs when 'de telle manière' would be preferable. 'Christ,' also, and 'de Christ' are used, instead of 'le Christ,' and 'du Christ,' or, what is still better, 'Jésus-Christ;,' while there is sad confusion in the use of the words 'dire,' 'lire,' 'réciter,' 'répéter,' and 'chanter.' We have noticed M. Mudry's great aversion to *traits-d'union*, just where they are wanted. The editor of the Prayer-Book before us, on the contrary, has a remarkable partiality for them where they are not wanted. Thus we have, 'tout-à-fait' (page 32), 'bien-heureuse' (page 53), 'long-temps' (page 307). As to the mere typographical mistakes, they are very few. We notice here and there such things as 'ajoûte' (pages 46, 47), 'trâces' (page 229), 'indamniser' (page 304), 'réposent' (page 320); but it is very possible these mistakes are the editor's, and not the printer's.

We do trust that the Christian Knowledge Society will at once place this Prayer-Book into the hands of a competent editor, who will subject the whole of it, with the exception of the Psalms, and the Epistles and Gospels (though the punctuation of these requires amendment), not to 'certain corrections' only, but to a thorough and most complete revision, and who will take care to combine fidelity of translation with correctness of language. In numberless places the force and meaning of the original have evaporated, and many whole passages require re-translation. As a whole the book is most unworthy the

original; it is even unworthy the Society; and we should only put it into the hands of a Frenchman through sheer want of something better. If revised with care from beginning to end, something could perhaps be made of the French 'Wilson;' but as it is, though it might possibly do for the *pâtres* of Savoy, for the *habitants* of the wilds of Canada, or for the fishermen of Herm and Jethou, it certainly is not adapted for circulation among Frenchmen. With regard to Bull's 'Corruptions,' or rather M. Mudry's, they ought to be instantaneously and mercilessly suppressed.

It is with no pleasurable, but, on the contrary, very mournful feelings, that we have felt compelled to make these remarks upon the works before us. If we could have commended them, we should have done so cheerfully; but this was impossible. No private individuals would venture to put them forth, and it is quite clear the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge ought not to do so. Of course we do not object to the Society's publishing translations of some of the best works on its lists (would that the catalogue were extended!)—just the reverse. There never was a more favourable opportunity than the present for the publication and dissemination of sound theological works in different European languages; and we should be glad to see the Society avail itself of it judiciously and largely. One excellent Society is already engaged in the task of enlightening foreigners on the *status* and principles of our Church; and with its ample funds, varied machinery, and unprecedented capabilities, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge might effectively co-operate with the Anglo-Continental in this hitherto most neglected, but most useful and necessary work. Correct and un mutilated translations of the Prayer-Book are especially within its province: and in its Foreign Translation Committee there are men of varied literature and extensive knowledge. We trust that next time we visit the Society's depository in search of translations, French or other, we shall be furnished with scholarlike books, such as would not do discredit either to the reputation of the Society, to the learned men who sit on its Committees, or to the Church of England, the interests and, indeed, the principles of which are scarcely served by such productions as those which we have been obliged to censure.

ART. II.—*The Existence of Evil Spirits proved, and their Agency, particularly in Relation to the Human Race, explained and illustrated.* By WALTER SCOTT.

IN a recent number we briefly noticed one of the series of the 'Congregational Lectures,' and could only express our regret, if not our surprise, that a subject so important should not have met with more worthy treatment. There are many others of the same series which are interesting and deserve our notice. At present we select one which, we think, will give our readers a much more favourable notion of the 'Congregational Lectures' than they could derive from Dr. Bennett's specimen.

In the work to which we allude, the president and tutor of Aire-dale College, a Dissenters' institution in Yorkshire, has chosen for his lectures a subject which we do not remember to have seen elsewhere treated in so popular a manner, and, we may fairly add, speaking generally, in a manner so edifying, and, upon the whole, orthodox. Not only does 'Walter Scott'—for so the author of these lectures is designated simply¹—defend the clear revelations of the Scripture concerning the existence of evil spirits, and their agency in relation to mankind, but he brings before us, in the early part of his work, some startling illustrations of the strange errors of certain 'free thinkers' of the present day respecting these truths. For instance, he quotes in his preface, from a pamphlet entitled 'The Devil,' an argument that because the devil is an evil spirit, it is atheism to believe that he exists at all, which thus concludes elegantly, that 'these devil-holders are practical atheists.' Again, in words quoted only, we believe, by our author, as by ourselves, to show what notions are held by certain gainsayers, the same irreverent writer argues that 'there is no necessity for a devil,' and quotes S. Paul's account of the works of the flesh, asking 'if the flesh is *capable to produce* (*sic*) all these, what is left for the devil to do?'

Since rubbish like this has been delivered in lectures, and afterwards published in a popular form, we must acknowledge

¹ It may be well at once to warn the reader of the danger of a confusion almost worse than the well-known puzzle in early ecclesiastical history between Novatus and Novatian. There are connected with this subject of communication with evil spirits no less than *four* writers of the name of *Scott*. 1. Walter Scott, of Aire-dale, our author. 2. Sir Walter Scott, Bart. of Abbotsford. 3. Reginald Scott, who wrote against the belief in witchcraft, and died A.D. 1599. 4. Russell Scott, a modern Sadducee, author of a work entitled, 'Analytical Investigation, or Scriptural Claims of the Devil.'

the obligation owing from all believers in Holy Scripture to Walter Scott's defence of the doctrine concerning evil spirits contained in the Bible. In this ninth series of the 'Congregational Lectures,' he discusses the existence of evil spirits, their character, state, and powers, their agency, the nature and manner of their intercourse with this world; the demoniacs of the New Testament, our Saviour's temptation, and the temptations of Satan in their ordinary form. Our readers will at once see how much of deep interest and close concern to every Christian this brief programme is capable of comprising. The general spirit of reverence with which he treats the testimony of others, and the supervision of Divine wisdom over the true doctrine of Scripture on the subject, is a pleasing feature in these Lectures. And though occasionally liberal (somewhat in excess), when speaking of the opposers of the doctrine he defends, yet the Congregational lecturer does not hesitate to speak elsewhere in very plain language concerning those modern Sadducees, who believe not in angels nor spirits, good or bad. Most truly does he state that 'those who maintain that evil spirits are the figments of a deluded imagination very generally deny the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel.' (P. 12.)

It is positively refreshing to find in a Congregational teacher the edifying and reasonable specimens which we subjoin of a line of argument not at all less true or less lucid because, if fairly carried out, it would effectually overturn the sandy foundations of Congregationalism itself. 'It is surely very strange,' argues the lecturer (and we fully agree with him), 'and far from being calculated to exalt our ideas of the volume of inspiration, or to increase our confidence in it, that the doctrine of the non-existence of evil spirits, if it be true, should remain utterly unknown for 1700 years: that the multitudes who were most earnestly desirous to ascertain the real meaning of the Word of God, and to take it as the rule of their conduct, should have been led by its language, and by the way in which the Saviour performed His miracles, to embrace a tenet which at last is found to be absurd, and even a gross reflection on the government and character of God; for in this light it is represented by our opponents.' (P. 15.) Elsewhere he speaks even more emphatically. 'Allow that they were some of the angels who kept not their first estate, and who are represented as the angels of Satan, and then everything in the passage' (Luke x. 17) 'is plain and natural. On the other supposition, everything is strained and unnatural, and our Lord employed language which His disciples could not possibly, in their circumstances, understand; nay, which necessarily confirmed, I had almost said sanctioned, some grossly erroneous

'views which they entertained; and He has thus contributed much to lead His followers, in all subsequent ages, into mistakes on a very important subject. Who can believe that the great Prophet and Teacher would act in this way? and that, too, when the great end of His mission, the destruction of the works of the devil, was concerned?' (Pp. 250-1.)

These are sound and sensible remarks; and we can only wish that Mr. Scott, and all other Congregationalists, would follow them out to the point to which they inevitably lead, viz. a reasonable belief in the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and in its teaching, in every age, since the Christian era. At the risk of anticipating what we shall have to notice more particularly hereafter, we are tempted to apply the sober judicious arguments just quoted to the Church's doctrine of baptismal regeneration, held always, everywhere, and by all people. Might we not paraphrase the passage, and apply it thus to our blessed Saviour's words to Nicodemus?—'Allow that, when Christians are baptized, they are born of water and of the Spirit, and then everything in the words of Christ (S. John iii. 3, 5) is plain and natural. On the other supposition, everything is strained and unnatural, and our Lord employed language which was almost sure to be misunderstood, and to lead His followers, in all subsequent ages, into error on a very important subject. Who can believe that the great Prophet and Teacher would act in this way? and that, too, when one great end of His mission, the new birth unto righteousness, which is the entrance into His kingdom, was concerned?'

To us, the antidote here provided in one of the 'Congregational Lectures' to one of the common errors of Congregationalism, appears most complete and satisfactory. And if the popular objection be made against the Church's system of 'being regenerate' first, and then striving to be 'daily renewed,' that this is too easy a system, and tends to false security, we may fairly ask in what respect the Calvinistic system is more difficult or less lulling? Were Calvinists consistent—which, happily, they often are not—self-examination and striving to enter in at the strait gate would be as quietly set aside by them as S. Paul's idea of becoming a castaway is evaporated in their able master's gloss upon that well-known text. We subjoin it, as one of the best specimens of a quiet mode of shirking an awkward passage we ever met with. Calvin thus paraphrases 1 Cor. ix. 27: '*Vita mea aliis regula quædam esse debet: contendendo igitur ita me gerere, ne doctrinæ mores mei et opera repugnent, atque ita cum magno dedecore et gravi fratrum meorum offenculo ea negligam quæ ab aliis requiro*'!

But while we feel justified in having turned the attention of

our readers towards the antidote furnished by our author, however unwittingly, against one of the most common and worst errors of the conventicle, and of those who sympathise with its peculiar teaching, we gladly resume our consideration of the generally correct and sober way in which Mr. Scott treats the interesting and important subject of his Lectures. In the first place, his specimens of the fashion in which Holy Scripture is interpreted by those that deny the existence of evil spirits are certainly rather startling, and to us, we acknowledge, quite novel. We must bespeak our readers' patience, while we enter somewhat at length upon these extraordinary samples of error, and ignorance of the Scriptures, amongst our modern Sadducees.

The well-known text in 2 Peter ii. 4 is thus translated by one of these unbelieving writers, who understands the whole passage to apply to the spies, or messengers (angels), sent to search the land of Canaan. 'For if God spared not the *messengers* that 'sinned, but having tartarized them with chains of darkness, 'delivered them, thus reserved, unto judgment,' &c. The commentary that follows is worthy of the translation: The spies 'sinned,' for when they returned they laid before the people an evil report: they were 'tartarized with chains of darkness,' i.e. judicially blinded. And then, to complete the confusion of ideas, this writer quoted by Walter Scott identifies the 'false prophets' at verse 1 with the 'angels' in v. 4! The Congregational lecturer candidly meets, and fully refutes, all this gratuitous and irreverent absurdity; though it may seem, after all, scarcely worth while to do so, since the man who disbelieves the existence of evil spirits is not likely to have any very strong faith in the canonicity of S. Peter's Second Epistle.

However, to the Churchman it is refreshing and encouraging to see a learned Congregationalist employing against those who deny truths which he holds in common with us arguments which will tell in the Church's favour against dissent. Thus, what our lecturer says in favour of the translation 'angels,' instead of 'messengers' or 'spies,' well deserves the attention of those who stoutly deny the change recorded by early writers to have been gradually wrought in the meaning of words like *ἐπισκοπος*, &c. 'Words,' Walter Scott tells his Congregational hearers, 'very frequently drop their original signification; and, 'in consequence of the change of customs, and of modes of 'thought and expression, this is almost forgotten, while they 'are used in quite a different sense.' (P. 21.)

Again, when the lecturer applies to the meaning of the word 'reserved' (*τερηημένους*) this remark, 'The perfect relates to the past as connected with the present,' he sanctions the very principle which, if applied to 1 John iii. 9, dispels much of the

obscurity with which modern theories have clouded that glorious text.¹ No better rebuke could have been given to these modern theories than that of our author, who truly states that, if the apostles (S. Peter and S. Jude) had intended 'the spies who brought up an evil report,' they would have said what they meant, as they did when speaking of Egypt, or of Sodom and Gomorrha. They would not, he well says, 'have used terms 'which have led ninety-nine out of a hundred of those who 'have read their writings to imagine that they referred to 'angelic beings; while it was left to the ingenuity of those 'who should live hundreds of years afterward to stretch their 'language on the rack of criticism, and elicit from it quite a 'different meaning from its apparently natural import!' (P. 27.) A tacit yet severe rebuke to many a popular religious theory! To take an example, corroborating what has been already said, from the book just quoted: 'If our Lord meant simply to 'direct Nicodemus to seek a new heart, is it likely that He 'would have expressed so old a truth in such new terms? And 'when Nicodemus (to all appearance a sincere inquirer) asks 'for an explanation, still more strange does it seem that our 'Lord should have increased the difficulty a thousand fold, by 'connecting *water* with the Spirit, as a needful element in 'bringing about such a change.' (Sadler's *Second Adam*, p. 26.)

It would be impossible to notice here the wild inventions of the writers quoted by Walter Scott respecting the meaning of the word translated 'devil' (*διδβολος*). In S. John viii. 44, it means, so they say, the Jewish Sanhedrim: elsewhere, a calumniator, or persecutor, or false accuser of the Christians; or, in short, anything but what the word has always been understood to mean by all Christians.² One specimen of Scripture interpretation, from a namesake of our author's, Russell Scott, who wrote 'Lectures on the Scriptural Claims of the Devil,' is too curious to be omitted. This writer explains the devil and his angels, mentioned in the latter part of S. Matthew xxv., to mean the persecuting power of Rome. The sheep are the Christians; the goats, the Jews. The everlasting fire is the temporal national calamities in which the opponents and persecutors of the Christians were involved. And both the reward and punishment here mentioned 'must,' in spite of our blessed Lord's own assertion, 'be of a temporary nature only,' according to Mr. Russell Scott's infallible *dictum*. How this can be made to tally with the historical fact that the *sheep* were more or

¹ See Mr. Sadler's admirable work, 'The Second Adam and the New Birth,' with the reference to Pool and Hammond in the note, p. 149.

² 'Satan is always used as a figurative appellation, and signifies almost anything or everything.' (Russell Scott, quoted by W. Scott, p. 52.)

less persecuted for nearly three hundred years, while the *goats* were also severely persecuted, and the *devil* and *his angels* wholly free from persecution, he does not tell us. But well does the Congregational lecturer observe, with reference to this preposterous rubbish: 'If I could think that the Socinian explanation of this passage were even plausible, I should immediately lose all confidence in the Bible, and question whether any man could have satisfactory evidence that he understood a single sentence it contains.' (P. 37.)

At the risk of being somewhat tedious, we must refer to two or three more samples of the reverence and reasoning which are being applied to the elucidation of Holy Scripture, and its teaching respecting evil spirits, by men, professing themselves to be wise men, in the present day. We know not where to look for a more concise yet complete account of these extraordinary interpretations than that given by Walter Scott in the earlier portion of his work. According to one of these most unreasonable, as well as unbelieving, *philosophers*, 'In the history of our Lord's temptations, Satan means in the first [temptation] "hunger," though we are informed that it was *after* He was hungry that the tempter came to Him: and this tempter is represented as a rational being entering into conversation with Him: in the second, "presumption and vanity;" and in the third, "ambition, as gratified by regal power and riches."' (P. 53.)

Mr. Russell Scott, under the influence of that unhappy spirit which so often governs those who feel that they are defending a bad cause, makes free to nickname those who believe in the plain sense of what the Bible declares to us, 'the devil's advocates.' To such he puts this dilemma: 'You are not prepared nor disposed to believe, I dare say, that Peter was the devil. If not, you must admit that Satan has some other meaning attached to it than that of the devil.' (P. 55.) Again, we are told that the Satan who desired to have S. Peter, that he might sift him as wheat, 'signifies, first the maid-servant, and then the others who charged Peter with being a disciple of Jesus Christ, and thus were the means of inducing him to deny His Master'! (P. 56.)

So to the purblind vision of the writer quoted by our lecturer the history of the fall of man seems 'an apologue to designate the placidity of a pastoral, or the activity of an agricultural life.' To the same prejudiced eyes 'the history of Cain and Abel appears to be symbolical of the transition from vegetable to animal sacrifices.' And in the account of the serpent having deceived Eve it is dogmatically declared that 'the reason for employing the serpent for (*sic*) one of the actors in the fable

'is evident.' Namely—could the reader have ever guessed it?—'to render more conspicuous the folly and absurdity of serpent worship, which had become very prevalent among the 'heathen nations!' (P. 60.)¹ True, indeed, as Mr. Walter Scott observes concerning this odd jumble of his namesake, Mr. Russell Scott: 'There are few things . . . more calculated to 'prove that the existence of evil spirits is clearly taught in the 'Scriptures, than to find those who deny it obliged to have 'recourse to such desperate methods to maintain their sentiments.'

'There can be no doubt'—the Congregational lecturer elsewhere says—'that the Seed of the woman meant Jesus Christ. 'He was not an allegorical personage. Had He nothing to 'contend with, but an allegorical enemy?' (P. 64.) This leads us at once to our main object in detaining our readers among figments so ridiculous and fancies so unreasonable. The very persons who are thus ready to explain away all the rest of the Bible are, usually, not very averse from explaining away the gospels also. These men, after allegorising the fall, and the temptation, and every other supernatural event in the Holy Scriptures, which they can get into their net, will seldom rest satisfied until they have woven the spider's web around the truth of the history of our blessed Lord. Thus, in opposition to the Congregational lecturer and to everybody who deserves the name of Christian, these people, left to themselves, are not unlikely to fall into the train of Strauss and others, and to maintain that Jesus Christ is an allegorical personage—so far, at least, as we are concerned with Him.

We need scarcely point out the consistency of such notions with the theory of the Socinians and other free-thinking professors of Christianity, who deny most facts or doctrines implying supernatural agency. Any one can see how logically the unbelieving premiss leads to the false and blasphemous conclusion. Once allow the fall to be an allegory and the serpent-tempter a myth, and then it seems almost incongruous to persist in holding that the bruising of the serpent's head refers to a real event, and that the seed of the woman is one individual, actual man. Hence the importance of endeavouring to expose theories so flippant and so flimsy as those noticed by our author with just reprobation. As he truly remarks—in reply to one of the unbelieving school, who asserts that to

¹ We subjoin a brief quotation from a work which places the subject in a totally different point of view. 'The most remarkable corroboration, however, of the Mosaic history is to be found in those fables which involve the mythological serpent, and in the worship which was so generally offered to him throughout the world.'—Deane 'On the Worship of the Serpent' (sec. ed.), p. 32.

'consider the Book of Job in any other light than as an allegory, 'would be to give up all title to common sense'¹—the mere supposition of Job being a fictitious being destroys all the force of most of those passages in Scripture where that patriarch is mentioned. Especially referring to S. James v. 11, our author asks where would be the force of the argument, if it only meant 'Ye have heard of the patience of a *fictitious being*, and have 'seen the end of the Lord, that the Lord is very pitiful and of 'tender mercy.' People might fairly reply: 'What is that to 'us? Ours are real sufferings. We need real patience. Where 'is the force of the apostle's argument?'—Here is 'a very fine 'picture of patience, in an imaginary person called Job:—be ye 'therefore patient amidst your real and protracted sufferings. 'What motives can this present to our minds?' (P. 73.)

Were the present a *thinking*, as well as a *reading* age, it would seem labour lost to dwell upon absurdities of this kind, which are scarcely more *plausible* even than they are *reasonable*. But so long as these idle moths and butterflies of infidelity are distracting the attention of men who shrink from the trouble of thinking for themselves, they deserve to be caught and broken on the wheel of criticism. We shall finish our exposure of the strange shifts to which modern Sadducees are driven, when they venture to deny the existence of unclean spirits, by abridging the conclusion of Walter Scott's argument against these gain-sayers drawn from the same book—the Book of Job. Even if it were an allegory and not a history, still, he argues, its allusions, as elsewhere in Holy Scripture, would be to real facts and to real beings. Thus 'the existence of Satan is just as 'much supposed here, as the existence of God, or of men, or of 'marauders, or of storms and diseases. Russell Scott thinks 'that the term Satan (adversary) is an appellative, and that it 'includes the Sabæans and Chaldæans, and the wind, and the fire, 'and the leprosy, all of which are dramatically represented as 'the enemies of Job. This is ridiculous: it implies a violation 'of even all dramatic laws, as well as of the principles of truth 'and nature. Could the robbers, and winds, and fire, and 'leprosy, be represented as appearing before God *amongst his 'sons?*—as being asked by Him whether they had considered 'His servant Job?—as intimating doubts respecting the sincerity 'of his piety?—as moving God against him to destroy him?—as 'daring God to put forth His hand, and touch all that he had?

¹ It would be amusing, were it not so sad, to observe how quietly these enemies of creeds and foes to dogmatism set down as simpletons all who differ from them! But, as no mean authority has lately said, '*Human opinion is as dogmatic as revelation.*' (Pusey's Comm. on Minor Prophets: Amos ii. 4.)

‘—as going out from the presence of the Lord and smiting Job with sore boils? How ineffably absurd!’ (Pp. 75, 76.)

And what blind presumption, what strange infatuation, in men professing to be wiser than their neighbours, to waste their time and talents in conceiving and in publishing these vain and prurient imaginations, by which the written Word of God is made ridiculous and of none effect!

The character, state, and powers of evil spirits are discussed at some length by Walter Scott, after having detailed and refuted the wild theories of those who deny that there are any evil spirits. We shall not enter very deeply into this part of the subject, although we can conscientiously recommend what he has written to the perusal of the Christian student. One observation antagonistical to the fearfully prevailing worship of intellect may, possibly, command more attention, as coming from a Congregationalist than if it came from ourselves. After remarking of the evil angels that, ‘perhaps the united intellect of hundreds of mortals would not equal that of the superior ranks, especially of their leader,’ he elsewhere repeats the axiom that ‘knowledge is power,’ and asserts that ‘it must be so in the case of the evil spirits.’ But then he remarks that ‘sin is always unfavourable to mental improvement, and that it always perverts the moral judgment and affections, and weakens the moral powers,’ yet ‘does not enervate the intellectual faculties.’ ‘How often,’ he adds, ‘do we find superior mental abilities connected with a most depraved heart and vicious life; almost the powers and acquirements of an angel, with the temper and conduct of a fiend!’ (Pp. 105, 116, 117.) And yet mere intellect—untamed, unsanctified by any higher or better powers than its own—is the fashionable object of worship, the darling idol, of the present age. An age in which it might be said with some appearance of truth, that, if the superficial extent covered by intellectual pretensions was never greater, the solid cubic measure of its real depth was never less. An example of this—the first which occurs to us—may be found in a book lying open before us, which we have had occasion to consult on the present subject.¹ The Socinian gloss upon the fact recorded by S. Mark that our blessed Saviour had cast out of Mary Magdalene seven devils is as follows: *i.e.* ‘whom Jesus had cured of raving madness. So Celsus understood the expression. See Farmer on Dem. p. 105.’ Were ever such shallow pretensions to learning and correct interpretation put forth? As if *Celsus* were an authority for Christian interpretation of the things of the spiritual world! And this

‘Improved Version of the New Testament.’ (Socinian.) Note on Mark xvi. 9.

is but a sample of 'popular intellect'—at least, in religious matters. We remember once meeting with a really thoughtful and able clergyman, who said that, whenever the tide of opinion was setting in very strongly against any of the great doctrines or universal customs of Christ's Church, he always found comfort and encouragement from reading a certain commentary by a clever, popular, hasty writer of the day. 'If such be popular 'divinity,' he argued—'so shallow, so empty—no wonder that 'the witness of the Church to the teaching of the Bible is 'despised and lightly treated!' So, after all, if intellect be our idol just now, it may be but a feeble and helpless object of worship.

There are several interesting observations of our lecturer, which deserve notice, but we must hasten on to more general inferences and assertions concerning the agency of evil spirits. Only we must give the meed of praise his ingenuity and good sense deserve for the quiet but striking way in which he disposes of that great stumbling-block in the way of certain persons, we mean the doctrine of eternal punishment. In more passages than one Mr. Walter Scott implies—most truly—that, unless we can deny the possibility of sinners being *incorrigible*, we must allow the necessity of the punishment of their sin being *eternal*, or else contradict all our moral ideas respecting the Divine attributes.

The subjects of witchcraft and magic, in connexion with what is stated on these subjects in Holy Scripture, are entered into very fully by the author of the Lectures before us. When he comes down to the days of the 'Puritan Fathers,' as he calls them, it requires a little tact and dexterity on his part to get over this chapter in the history of witchcraft without showing up in too strong colours such men as Baxter, Cotton Mather, or 'the infamous Hopkins'—the notorious witchfinder. To the latter our author shows, indeed, very little mercy, and he is made a sort of scapegoat for the rest of the Puritans. The others, however, are dealt with more leniently, and from the simple premiss that Baxter believed in witchcraft, the following old conclusion is drawn in rather more of a puritanical tone than this writer commonly indulges. 'Lord, what is man!' he exclaims; 'verily, every man in his best estate is, in every respect, altogether vanity.' Too true, no doubt, but surely a truth rather far-fetched, when deduced from Richard Baxter's belief in witchcraft!

But Mr. Walter Scott's treatment of this period of 'witch-finding,' when Presbyterianism bore sway, demands a little closer attention; and we think we can supply his narrative with a few additional facts, which he must have known, and ought

not to have omitted. We wonder how many pages in the Congregational Lecture would have been taken up with diatribes against 'persecution,' 'bigotry,' and 'intellectual darkness,' if Hopkins, the witch-finder, had been an 'Episcopalian;' or if poor old Lewis, who was hanged as a wizard, after having been about fifty years vicar of Brandiston, in Suffolk, had been a *rebel*, instead of a *royalist*, a *ranting*, instead of 'a *reading parson*;' and had had Archbishop Laud, instead of 'Mr. Calamy, present with the judges on the circuit, to see that 'there was no fraud or wrong done' the accused! What an opportunity for dwelling on the Church's intolerance and blindness would any Dissenting writer have had, if the following ascending scale of barbarity had ascended with the rise and triumph, not of Dissenting, but of Church principles!—'In 1612, fifteen indicted' for witchcraft 'at Lancaster, and twelve condemned; 1622, six tried at York; 1634, seventeen condemned in Lancashire; 1644, sixteen executed at Yarmouth; 1645, fifteen condemned at Chelmsford and hanged; in the same and following year, about forty at Bury, in Suffolk, twenty more in the county, and many at Huntingdon;' and 'according to the estimate of Ady, some thousands were burnt in Scotland.' (*Retrospect. Review*, vol. v. p. 114.) Now we are quite prepared to take our full share in the shame that attaches to such doings, but we must beg leave to draw the attention of our Dissenting brethren to these and other similar facts, in the hope that it may moderate the warmth of their prejudices against the bigotry and persecuting spirit of the Church. Alas! whenever we hear the stern Nonconformist, with a sardonic smile, enlarging upon the intolerance of mitred men and crowned heads, we cannot help thinking of the poet's question:—

'Quid rides? mutato nomine de te
Fabula narratur.'

Again, if we follow our lecturer across the Atlantic, we shall find him still disposed to deal rather too gently with those Pilgrim Fathers and their children, whose degenerate descendants have now so generally become either Socinians or 'Episcopalians.' 'Even in New England,' we are told, 'mournful as was the tragedy that was acted there, it is evident that the piety and good sense of the descendants of the Puritan Fathers rendered the scene less gloomy than it would otherwise have been. Had it not been for these, instead of sixteen months and nineteen executions, the withcraft mania might have continued for years, and sacrificed hundreds of victims. It is not neces-

¹ The result is worth attending to. In three or four years at least one hundred persons put to death for witchcraft, in only four counties, and those all four 'associated counties,' to say nothing of the fires lit in Scotland!

'sary to enlarge:' (p. 189)—and yet we are strongly tempted to do so! But it shall only be with one question. What Dissenters would accept this evidence of any Christian community (but their own) abounding in 'piety and good sense,' that they were crazy for sixteen months, and not for years, and that they murdered only nineteen persons, instead of 'sacrificing hundreds of victims'?

In concluding this digression, we willingly appeal from the Walter Scott, with whom we are at present concerned, to another author of the same name, and better known to fame, who has stated the case, in our opinion, much more fairly. Sir Walter Scott speaks sensibly and impartially, and acknowledges (as all parties must) that 'the witchcraft mania' was quite in accordance with 'the spirit of the age' in which it so extensively prevailed. But he does not hesitate to assert that the popular religionists of the day were the most severely bitten by this mania. He speaks boldly, in one passage, of 'the numberless extravagances of the Scottish Dissenters of the seventeenth century, now canonized in a lump by those who view them in the general light of enemies to Prelacy.' Elsewhere he avers, that 'the ministers of the Church of England, though less prone to prejudice than those of other sects, are yet far from being entirely free of encouraging in particular instances the witch superstition.' But, in Sir Walter Scott's opinion, 'On the whole, the Calvinists, generally speaking, were, of all the contending sects, the most suspicious of sorcery, the most undoubting believers in its existence, and the most eager to follow it up with what they conceived to be the due punishment of the most fearful of crimes.' Thus, 'the most severe of the laws against witchcraft originated with a Scottish king of England'—the only extensive persecution following that statute was when the Calvinists were, for a short time, in full power. So that 'the temporary superiority of the Presbyterians in England was marked by enormous cruelties of this kind.'

But to return from *Sir* Walter to *Mr.* Walter Scott. This last gentleman truly asserts that 'the belief in witchcraft has been degrading and pernicious.' If we had time to spare, we fancy we could corroborate this assertion by tracing its degrading and pernicious effects most prominently in the history of those who held most firmly and acted most fiercely on this very belief, as it was popularly held by men pretending to monopolise all the religion of their day. It was a Presbyterian rule recommended to Wodrow to leave out 'what is merely

¹ See Sir W. Scott's 'Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft.' Letter VIII.

NO. CXVII.—N.S.

D

'circumstantial, except where it is necessary for illustrating the matter, or *aggravating the crimes of our enemies.*'¹ We fear Mr. Walter Scott has deemed it lawful to do something of this sort, in the matter of witchcraft, for diminishing the (comparative) innocence of his adversaries. We sincerely wish that all Christian controversialists were quite clear from any suspicion of this kind. Or supposing that to be impossible, we wish it were, at least, confined to followers of Ignatius Loyola and Protestant Dissenters.

From the agency of evil spirits, real or imaginary, in cases of witchcraft, our author proceeds to consider the Sibylline verses and the heathen oracles in connexion with such agency. And if his discussion of this part of his subject is not very original nor full of depth, still it is worth reading, and may at least *instruct*, though it may not *convince* many. In truth, this writer appears scarcely to have made up his own mind upon many points in this difficult matter, and he certainly does not, generally speaking, dogmatise upon it, but endeavours rather to place candidly before his readers different theories and views. One exception, perhaps, to his usual candour, is the way in which he treats the Fathers—of whom, nevertheless, he once or twice speaks very highly indeed. We believe that great allowances must be made for a Nonconformist writer in these cases, and that the very words of S. Jerome, referred to by another Dissenter, Hugh Farmer, whom Mr. Walter Scott quotes, will apply to the Nonconformists much more closely than to the Fathers: '*Quia interdum coguntur loqui, non quod sentiunt, sed quod necesse est.*' Evidently our lecturer has a mind and a heart capable of appreciating, in some degree, Christian antiquity. And, not less evidently, he felt that a Congregational lecturer could not afford to venture too far upon this—to him—dangerous ground. A few extracts will best serve to throw light upon our meaning, and to illustrate the anomalous position of a Dissenter at all versed in ecclesiastical antiquity and of ingenuous mind:—

'The Fathers,' he says, 'with all their defects, were a pious, noble, devoted class of men. With how much heartiness did they embrace the religion of the cross! How firmly did they believe it!² How fearlessly did they advocate its cause! How did they, in some respects, adorn it by their lives! How ready were they to die on its behalf! How certain is it that they are now receiving the reward promised to those who confessed Christ before men! Well would it be for their successors in the present day, if, in addition to their more extensive and accurate knowledge, they had the heartiness, and zeal, and faith of these ancient supporters of the Christian religion. I am far from joining with those who despise and revile them, and are disposed to think that it would be

¹ See Bishop Russell's '*History of the Church in Scotland.*' Vol. ii. page 250, note.

² "How," asks the Congregational Lecturer, "can we reject their statements, without undermining all testimony as a ground of faith?"

well for the cause of religion and of the church, if all their writings were blotted out from existence.²—Pp. 224, 225.

Thus far we cordially agree with our author, and cannot but admire his candour; for whatever good the Patristic writings may do to the cause of religion and the Church,¹ we doubt very much their greatly serving the cause of the meeting-house. Probably Dr. Bennett—another Congregational lecturer, of whom our readers know something—was more true to his dissenting theory, when, instead of praising the Fathers, he declares, unequivocally, that ‘There is scarcely an error in doctrine, or corruption in practice, or superstition in worship, by which the church was ever troubled, that may not be traced to very early times, and that was not defended by some venerated name.’ (Bennett’s *Cong. Lectures*, p. 263.)

And Mr. Walter Scott, notwithstanding all that he says in behalf of the Fathers, speaks—from habit or necessity, we presume—rather slightly of them, when he comes to consider their witness about the heathen oracles. ‘With all their excellencies,’ according to him, ‘some of them were weak men, and all of them superstitious.’ (P. 225.) Nay, in a note in the Appendix (K.), the lecturer quotes Hugh Farmer and Conyers Middleton in proof of it having been ‘shown only too clearly that the Fathers are not entitled to the praise of even sincerity and honesty.’ How it can be ‘certain’ that, though not ‘sincere and honest,’ they are ‘now receiving the reward promised to those who confessed Christ before men,’ he does not explain. And we cannot.

In treating of the difficult subject of the heathen oracles,² our author is more diffuse and laborious than successful. In spite of such authorities as Conyers Middleton, Hugh Farmer, and Isaac Taylor, proving the Fathers to have been ‘not only superstitious and easily deceived, but quite capable of practising

¹ We print ‘Church’ with a capital. The Congregationalists seem to prefer a small initial letter.

² The reader will, perhaps, excuse, for its own sake, the following quotation:—

‘Spartano cuidam respondit Pythia vates,
Haud impunitum quondam fore, quod dubitaret
Depositum retinere, et fraudem jure tueri
Jurando; querebat enim quæ numinis esset
Mens; et an hoc illi facinus suaderet Apollo
Reddidit ergo metu, non moribus, et tamen omnem
Vocem adyti dignam templo, veramque probavit,
Extinctus totâ pariter cum prole domoque,
Et quamvis longâ deductis gente propinquis,
Has patitur poenas peccandi sola voluntas.
Nam scelus intra se tacitum qui cogitat ullum
Facti crimen habet.’—(Juv. Sat. xiii.)

Such specimens of heathen oracles tend to make the question whence they proceeded doubly perplexing.

imposition' (p. 230, n.), the lecturer's arguments against what they state are uncommonly poor and feeble. For example, he argues that the oracle at Delphi must have been managed by the craft of man, because 'surely Satan, had he been permitted, could have managed things better than' they were managed. (P. 209.) So, no doubt, Satan, had he been permitted, could have managed things better for his own purpose by killing holy Job at once, and thus defrauding all succeeding ages of his glorious prophecy of the Messiah and pattern of patience. The reply in both cases is obvious. *He was not permitted.* So again, under the treacherous guidance of men like Conyers Middleton, our author sometimes ventures, in this part of his subject, upon a line of argument which scarcely seems consistent with certain facts recorded in Holy Scripture. At page 226, when he contrasts the Fathers with Jesus Christ and His Apostles, he appears altogether to ignore what is recorded in Holy Writ about touching the hem of our Lord's garment, or of the effect of S. Peter's shadow passing by, or of the handkerchiefs and aprons of S. Paul. These are just the things which he would not hesitate to call instances of superstition or credulity, if recorded by the Fathers only.

It is rather a hasty assertion that 'we have no evidence that 'God ever permitted any *real* miracle to be performed, or even 'wonder to be exhibited, or true prophecy to be uttered, in 'support of any false religion.' (P. 208.) When we refer to texts like Deut. xiii. 2, Matthew xxiv. 24, and Rev. xiii. 13, and xvi. 14—to pass over a multitude of others—we dare make no such assertion. If we cannot prove that God does permit *real* wonders to be wrought by the powers of evil, we dare not affirm that He does not. Indeed, Mr. Walter Scott, when he comes to consider the circumstances of Christ's temptation, takes (we are happy to say) the right view, though (we are sorry to say) he contradicts himself. For he completely puts aside the theories of Le Clerc, Hugh Farmer, &c., and clings firmly to the literal interpretation of what took place in the temptation. Nay, he notices the objection that this literal sense involves the admission of a certain power in Satan, on certain occasions, of working what we call miracles. Hugh Farmer's objection to the literal interpretation of our Lord's temptation is that 'it ascribes to the devil the performance of the greatest miracles.' To this our author truly replies—though we think his reply contradictory to the assertion we have just quoted—'How limited is our experience! How 'egregiously shall we err, if we make it the measure of all that 'is possible, of all that spirits can do, of all that has been! We 'have no experience of the performance of miracles; but shall

'we therefore conclude that none were ever wrought? This is exactly Hume's argument against miracles in general. . . . But this objection is founded entirely on Farmer's theory respecting evil spirits, which is by no means granted. It is evident from many examples recorded in the Scriptures, that the good angels have the power of assuming a visible form, of speaking with an audible voice, and of removing bodies from one place to another.' 'Doing so,' he continues, 'does not imply a miracle in the proper sense of the word.' But we think it does. And Johnson's definition of a miracle (in theology) corroborates our view: 'An effect above human or natural power, performed in attestation of some truth.' In this sense it would indeed be true that evil spirits do no *real* miracle, not because the effect is not *real*, but because it is wrought to prove a falsehood. But this very fact is implied by the expression used of such wonders. They are called *false* miracles, not because they are not really above natural or human power, but because they are worked in order to make men believe a lie. And thus, though actually wrought, they may be but 'strong delusions' after all. The subject is altogether a difficult one, and we pronounce no opinion upon it ourselves. But we must say that the Fathers, whether right or wrong, have treated this difficult subject more consistently than Mr. Walter Scott has.

The Congregational lecturer insists very strongly and properly upon the reality of the demoniacal possessions recorded in Holy Scripture, and takes great pains in replying to Hugh Farmer's theories of a contrary tenor. When we quote one or two of these, by way of specimen, we think our readers will be satisfied. Farmer's favourite doctrines are 'that all cases of 'supposed possessions are only diseases, and that the temptations of Jesus Christ took place in a vision, and that this was 'presented to Him by the Holy Spirit, and not by Satan'! Again, the same writer, trying to account for the fear felt by the unclean spirits that Christ had come to torment them, 'quotes with approbation the sentiments of Wetstein, who supposes that the demoniac was afraid of being *beaten* or *bound*, 'or having some *ungrateful purgative* administered to him.' (Pp. 245, 259.)

From such irreverent trash we gladly turn to a passage, in which Walter Scott forcibly exposes the shallow philosophy—theology we cannot call it—which would shut out either good angels or bad from any intercourse with this lower world—the plain language of Holy Writ notwithstanding. He asks:—

'Who can tell how extensive is the sphere of action allotted to superior beings? Are we warranted to conclude that because man, on account of the grossness of his body, and the influence of the laws of gravitation, is confined

to this earth, that angels, whether good or bad, must be unable to visit various parts of the universe? It is just as if a horse or a sheep, supposing it capable of thought or reflection, were to conclude, that, because it cannot navigate the ocean, and leave the little island in which it is located, therefore no creatures in existence can visit those parts of the earth which are separated by the mighty deep: or as if a shell-fish, were it able to reason, were to conclude, that, because it cannot leave the rock to which it adheres, therefore every living thing must be so confined, and that the law under the influence of which it exists, must be universal.—P. 246.

We cannot but commend the foregoing quotation to the careful consideration of some of those who are trying to pass for the deep thinkers of the day, and who really themselves believe the delusion which they are passing off upon others!

In this part of his Lectures our author explains more particularly what he deems to be a miracle, viz. what changes or supersedes the great established laws of nature. And he repeats his assertion that neither angels nor devils are able to work miracles: which, probably, is true, if his definition be accepted. According to the better definition we have borrowed from the great lexicographer, we must reiterate our assertion that it is untrue. Even Mr. Scott acknowledges that 'if spirits 'are able to operate upon matter' (which he concedes), 'they 'may be supposed to be able to effect some things which would 'appear to us to be miraculous.' Still he will not allow that they can work *real* miracles, and uses a sort of *à priori* argument that 'God would not suffer any one to forge the great seal in such a 'way as that the imposition could not be detected.' But what if we have been told beforehand of these great signs and wonders? What if we have been already warned not to go after any wonder-workers, saying, 'Lo, here is Christ! or, Lo, He is there!' What, if we are told that, if an apostle, or even an angel from heaven come to us bringing us a new gospel, he is accursed? Even if the miracles were to our limited faculties ever so real, yet need they not, therefore, deceive the elect. Nor would they deceive them. The cause for which they were wrought would be a sufficient test whereby to judge of the power that wrought them. Thus, to borrow the words of our author, 'the wrath of devils, as well as of men, is caused to praise God, and the remainder of it is restrained.' (P. 270.)

We have already alluded to Farmer's hypothesis of our blessed Lord's temptation being only a vision, and we must say that Mr. Walter Scott fully exposes the false and unsatisfactory character of this theory. Space will not allow us to dwell long upon this part of the subject, but we may notice in passing two rather remarkable coincidences. The Congregational lecturer, in the course of his argument, puts the following question: 'What 'right have we to suppose, however it may have been asserted

'by some, and taken for granted by others, that Satan knew in 'what sense Jesus Christ was the Son of God, or that he was 'acquainted with the doctrine of His Divinity?' Here the reader will at once recognise one of the three mysteries spoken of by S. Ignatius of Antioch,¹ and it is curious to trace this apparently unconscious following of the Bishop and martyr of the second century by the dissenting teacher of the nineteenth.

Again we recognise, in a quotation from Hugh Farmer, the dissenting teacher of the last century, one of the strange notions—viz. that spirits, or, at least, the evil spirits, have no power over matter—which have proved a nine days' wonder to our sober countrymen in the recent 'Essays and Reviews.' The writers in that extraordinary, but not very original volume, must often have occasion to say, if ever they study the records of ancient heresies, and modern freethinkers:—

'Pereant, qui nostra ante nos dixissent'!

In conclusion, the Congregational lecturer endeavours to draw some practical benefit from his consideration of the agency of evil spirits, and treats of what he calls the most important, though last, part of his subject, viz. the temptations of Satan in their common or ordinary form. The idea is better than the manner of carrying it out. The bitter spirit in which the author speaks of *idolatry* alone, would lead any one who knew no better, to imagine, not that it was *only one* of the manifest works of the flesh, but that it was *the only one*. He seems to forget that such sins as hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions (*δικοστασίαι*), heresies, and others, are just as enticing to man's fallen nature, and just as apt handles of temptation as idolatry itself. It is mere falsehood to assert that soon 'Satan found a more efficient vicegerent in the Man of Sin, 'than ever he had done in the pagan emperor!' (P. 322.) And were we Romanists, how gladly should we welcome an opponent who came forth to meet us with arguments, or assertions rather, like this!

But Mr. Scott is a Dissenter—Dissenters of course think themselves and their system to be right; and the reverse of what they think must therefore be wrong, so the Romish system is called an antichristian system, and two whole pages are occupied in showing that there are no allurements which unrighteousness could possibly present, not to be found in that system. We are no advocates of the errors of the Church of Rome, and must leave those that are so to defend these against Congregational obloquy. They will find this an easier task to accomplish than when those that 'protest' stand upon higher, better, firmer

¹ Τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς. S. Ignat. ad. Eph. § 19.

ground. But we may, in our turn, protest against the cool assumption of the dissenting lecturer, that 'Baptismal Regeneration' is one of Rome's abominations, intended to allure 'those who did not care to examine whether they were born again, and to labour to enter in at the strait gate.' (P. 323.) This notable assertion figures again, we observe, in Mr. Walter Scott's brief index thus: 'Baptismal Regeneration, a delusion of Satan, 323.' The proof of this is nowhere assayed, unless, indeed, it be proof enough of any doctrine that it is a delusion of Satan to show that the Church of Rome holds it. But this doctrine, though held by Rome, is no peculiarity belonging to that Church's creed any more than the resurrection of the dead or the truth of Holy Scripture is.

If this be one of Rome's abominations, however, it is one that was received and held by the whole Christian Church from the beginning. If it be one of Satan's delusions, it is a delusion that has deceived the very elect in all ages of the Church. And, still more strange, it is the Socinians, Quakers, sceptics, and unbelievers, who have discovered the delusion and rejected the abomination! It is those who denied the Lord that bought them, who have in all ages been foremost in doing despite unto the Spirit of grace bestowed in Holy Baptism.

Possibly it was the latent consciousness of being in the wrong—even on their own principles—which so often both weakens and embitters the theology of Dissenters, that dictated the following passage—a passage which we cheerfully acknowledge is by no means a fair sample of the spirit of that series of 'Congregational Lectures' with which we are now concerned. 'There cannot be a doubt,' it is said, 'that if Puseyism, with its pestilent heresies, destroying the very spirit of the Gospel, should make a little more progress, it will soon have its lying miracles, to subserve the schemes of the crafty, and excite the astonishment of the ignorant and superstitious.¹ Thus it will, in two ways, most effectually answer the ends of Satan: it will counteract and neutralise, in the case of those who embrace it, the influence of the religion of Jesus Christ, and expose it to the sneers of infidels and of the profane, and furnish them with pretexts for altogether rejecting the claims of the Bible.' (P. 361.)

Such ebullitions are much more fitted to awaken the pity than the wrath of every well-trained mind. And even the most zealous Protestants are involved in the same indiscriminate con-

¹ It is now eight years since the date of the new edition of Scott's Lectures, which lies before us, and we cannot think of anything like a fulfilment of this prediction, unless, indeed, it be found (which we do not pretend to say it is) in the recent history of what are called 'Revivals.'—See *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xxxix. p. 364.

demnation, not only of Popery, but of whatsoever lies between Popery and Congregationalism. It is said, even of a 'Luther, a Zuingle, and a Knox, and many others,' that 'they could not unravel all these arts of Satan—they could not break through all the trammels in which they were held, and cast off the whole of the yoke which had been imposed on the Church of God, nor escape from all the fascinations of "the deceivableness of unrighteousness!"' (P. 324.) The Socinians might fairly enough apply this lamentation even to the 'Independent Churches' and their leaders!

But we wish not to enter into the matter any further. We think our two last quotations may safely be left to speak for themselves. Supposing the assertion to be true that even 'Luther, Zuingle, Knox, and many others, carried much of the spirit of the antichristian system which they exploded into the Churches which they formed,' and that 'there it remains, to a lamentable extent, to this day, and is operating to produce a retrograde movement'—we seem almost drifted downwards to the inevitable conclusion that all Christian Churches are antichristian. We beg pardon for saying *all*. Of course, the 'Congregational Churches' form an exception!

But we do not mean to part with our author in ill humour. If the reader will bear with us, while we put before him a favourable specimen of the practical lessons the lecturer deduces from his subject, we will then soon release him. Contrasting the inability of Satan now to tempt us personally and visibly, with the way in which he does now tempt us by means of literature, Mr. Walter Scott says—

'How effective a minister of Satan is the learned infidel philosopher, metaphysician, or historian, or the atheistic licentious poet, or the irreligious scoffing novelist, who renders all the stores of his learning, and the creations of his imagination, and the colourings of his fancy, subservient to arraying piety in the garb of enthusiasm, or hypocrisy, or of a contemptible weakness; and heartless licentiousness and cruelty in the attractions of sincerity and ingenuousness and nobleness of spirit! How dreadful the responsibility of those who thus pervert the most valuable gifts of the Father of spirits—of Him who puts knowledge into the heart, and wisdom into the inward parts! How much would the influence of Satan be diminished were he thrown, as it regards every individual, entirely on his own resources and direct attacks! This deserves the attention and grave consideration of all, who, by purchasing and reading such works, and even recommending them, because of the genius and learning of their authors, contribute to preserve them from oblivion, and even to increase their celebrity.'—P. 328.

We had intended to make some brief remarks on two or three rather bold assertions, which our author ventures to make *ex cathedra*, i. e. from the Congregational pulpit. We shall, however, mention but one of these, namely, his incidental assumption that S. Paul's Epistles were 'epitomes of his preaching to

the Gentiles.' This statement is forestalled and refuted in Woodgate's 'Bampton Lectures,' especially in Lecture the Fourth; and it is chiefly for the sake of recommending, at this crisis of our faith, those admirable Lectures to our readers' careful perusal, that we notice the Independent lecturer's hasty notion that S. Paul's Epistles resemble in character the well-known 'Skeletons' of the amiable and indefatigable Charles Simeon!

In reply to the important question, How are we to vanquish our infernal deadly enemies? the lecturer most truly answers—1. By Christ's power, grace, and merit: 2. By keeping our own hearts with all diligence; 3. By continual vigilance; 4. By using all the means of grace. And we do not know that we can conclude better than with the following sober truths and wholesome warnings connected with the subject of the agency of evil spirits:—

'Alas! how much of our security arises from our inability to see and hear our spiritual enemies, the hosts of hell, and from the practical unbelief of which this is the occasion! But we must in this respect, as well as others, "look not at the things which are seen, but at those which are not seen." Whether we believe it or not, the fact is certain—we must overcome them, or else they will vanquish and completely destroy us. There is no medium; none can avoid the conflict. They will attack us; they have attacked us. Let us beware of the extremes of either attributing to Satan everything which is sinful, or nothing; of thinking and speaking as if he were omniscient or omnipresent, or as if we forgot that his knowledge, and power, and activity are fearfully great.'

—P. 345.

ART. III.—*Historical Sketch of the Early Literature of the Lord's Prayer.*

THE history of the literature of our Saviour's Prayer is almost coextensive with the history of the Church.

Not, indeed, altogether so. The ecclesiastical writings of the very earliest times were called forth by peculiar circumstances which required them. The Epistle of Clement of Rome, *e.g.* in the first century, was designed to compose the differences, and put an end to the disorder, which prevailed in the Corinthian Church. And the writings of the second century were either directed against the practical hostility of the Roman governors, as the Apologies of Justin Martyr, Quadratus, Aristides, and others, or were intended, as the great work of Irenæus, to meet the speculative errors of the Gnostic heresy, the chief doctrinal opponent of the rising Christian Church. For other writing than what such necessities of the times called forth, no leisure was found by the great minds of those early days. To go out as missionaries into far-distant lands, and spread the knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, was the work of the first century. To disseminate this knowledge through the length and breadth of each land thus evangelized; to fill up, as it were, in detail what had only been sketched in outline in the first century, was the work of the second. Thus, to instruct, and train, and direct, and support all who could be brought within the sphere of their influence—this was the work and the joy of the Christians of the earliest times. They had themselves learnt the Gospel of Christ, and felt themselves bound to make others sharers of the light and the blessings which they had received. For this they were empowered and enlightened by the Holy Spirit within; to this they were constrained by the love of their Saviour and Lord.

But from about the beginning of the third century the aspect of things was changed. The Gospel was now more or less widely and fully spread.¹ Christian teachers were now more abundant. And so it was possible, for men who felt themselves called to such a work, to sit down and meditate on the life and words of the Lord, for the benefit of themselves and the instruc-

¹ Tertullian writes, 'Obsessam vociferantur civitatem; in agris, in castellis, in insulis Christianos; omnem sexum, etatem, conditionem, etiam dignitatem, transgredi ad hoc nomen quasi detrimento merent.'—Apol. ch. i. The same thing is repeated 'Ad Nationes,' ch. l., in almost the same words.

tion of others throughout all time, without any mistrust lest they should be withdrawing from their proper ministerial work, enjoying the luxury of intellectual and spiritual contemplation themselves, while others were dying for lack of that simple food which it was their duty to supply.

And from that time, onward to the present day, the Prayer of our Lord has been the favourite subject for reflection to men of all times, placed under every variety of condition, and possessed of every variety of character and mind. Scarcely any important period of the Church has passed without producing its own commentary on the Lord's Prayer, stamped more or less with the character of the circumstances under which it was written, and of the inner peculiarities of the author by whom it was composed.

Natural, indeed, it was that men should thus address themselves from the first to the work of unfolding, and illustrating, and applying, the meaning of the Lord's Prayer. It was not only that they had here the words of the Saviour, the very expression of God upon earth; this might be said equally of all the Sermon upon the Mount, of which, at least on one occasion of its being delivered, it formed a part. It was more than this. It was that they had here the most perfect form in which to fulfil the highest and most important duty of the Christian life. Using this prayer, they would pray for such things as Christ Himself had taught them they might ask of God. Using it, they would pray in the manner most acceptable to God, for they would be praying in the very words of the Son of God. And further, they had in this (as is shown in the Second Dissertation on the Prayer) a model according to which their own prayers should be framed. And, once more, they had in it a rule for the practical conduct of life. The duties which should be performed, the motives by which they should be actuated, the hopes by which they should be supported in their earthly course, were all involved in the Lord's Prayer. For prayer, if it is to have any reality, must be the correlative and expression of our actual life. And a divine form of prayer, therefore, is really nothing less than a divine rule. What subject, then, could claim a preference over this? How could the mind be more profitably occupied than in endeavouring to fathom as far as possible the depths of the meaning of this Divine Prayer; so as both to enter into it more fully when addressing God in the words of it, and also to apply the truths and lessons involved in it to the conduct of daily life?

The consequences of this multiplicity of writers on the Lord's Prayer are twofold. On the one hand the Prayer, looked at through the medium of the various commentaries upon it, is seen in the

greatest variety of application, and with a more full and many-sided view of its meaning than has been given of any other portion of the words of our Lord. And, reversely, the literature of the Lord's Prayer, regarded historically, supplies, as it were, a long vista, through which may be seen the varying lights and shadows, the ever-changing circumstances and fortunes, of the Church. And it may be said of the literature of the Lord's Prayer, as Professor Stanley says of the English Prayer-Book, that it is a long gallery of ecclesiastical history, which, to be understood and enjoyed thoroughly, absolutely compels a knowledge of all the greatest names and events of all periods of the Christian Church. In the course of an historic review of the various authors who have written on the prayer, not only are their respective treatises on the prayer, with their merits and demerits, advantages and disadvantages, brought before the view, but also the character and personal history of the writers themselves, and so the circumstances of the Church at the period at which they wrote, are brought before the mind in a series of interesting as well as instructive scenes. And, further, some glimpses are afforded of the change which took place from time to time in the ritual of the Church, through the changes which occurred in the use or position of the Lord's Prayer, holding a place, as it did, in the services of public and private worship, from very early times.

Accordingly, there are two ways of treating the examination of the Prayer. Either it may be examined critically and theologically, the Prayer itself being kept essentially as the main subject in view, and all the light being thrown upon it which can be gathered into a centre from the commentaries which have been composed to explain it in various times: or it may be regarded historically, the eye being fixed not so much now on the Prayer itself, as on the writings upon the Prayer, those writings being taken as supplying a more or less complete illustration, from an interesting point of view, of the history of the Christian Church. The subject has been treated in the first mode in the exposition of the Lord's Prayer by Mr. Karslake. We propose ourselves, in the following pages, to pursue the second course, and to give a short sketch of the history of the Church, as illustrated by the history of the literature of the Lord's Prayer. It will not be possible, indeed, within the limits of a single article, to pass all the writers under review, however briefly. We propose, therefore, to confine ourselves, for the present, to those who wrote in the times of the Early Church.

Sketch of Tertullian.—It is remarkable that all the first great treatises on the Lord's Prayer proceeded from members of the African Church. Planted originally, according to the tra-

dition preserved in Eusebius,¹ at Alexandria by S. Mark, the Egyptian Church consisted in the third and fourth centuries of a number of Christian communities, dotted about in spots along, or near to, the Mediterranean coast, and also planted in Numidia, and other localities more inland. Foremost among the Churches on the coast was that of Carthage. The subject of Rome, and using the language of her conquerors, Carthage gave birth, in Tertullian, and Cyprian, and Augustine, to writers whose fame rivals that of any writers of the Roman, or even of the whole Western Church. But the peculiarity of its condition has stamped its impress upon the writings which it has produced. The subtlety of the Carthaginian character was blended with the practical sense and force of the Roman. And this union appears in the intricacy, and love of antithesis, and occasional forcing and wresting of the natural meaning of passages and words, which mar the great beauty and power of the works of Tertullian and Augustine. Thus, to take a single instance, Tertullian, arguing that a Christian should not be a soldier, gives as a proof from Scripture, 'Omnem militem Dominus in Petro exarmando discinxit,'—'Our Lord for ever forbid men to be soldiers when' 'He commanded S. Peter to put up his sword into its sheath.'² Tertullian was born at Carthage about the middle of the second century, and was brought up in heathenism, with the licence which heathenism commonly involved.³ He added to the characteristics of the Carthaginian character noticed above, an ardent, passionate temperament,⁴ with the impatience which usually accompanies it;⁵ and this appears throughout in his writings, and led him to extreme views. It is important to realize his position, and the condition of the Church in his time.

His Times.—Converted to Christianity, though in what way is unknown, and ordained a presbyter of the Church, he looked with horror from his new state on the conduct of the heathen world. Deep accordingly was his indignation at finding Christians, under one excuse or another, mixing, through the laxity which a time of peace had produced, in the customs of the heathen around them, or engaged in trades which supplied the requisites for heathen licentiousness or idolatry. And deeper still was his grief to find some even selected to hold office in the ministry of the Church who had applied themselves to such unlawful occupa-

¹ Euseb. Ch. Hist. book II. ch. xvi.

² De Idol. ch. xix.

³ 'Hac et nos aliquando risimus. De vestris fuimus. Fiunt non nascuntur Christiani.'—Apol. ch. xviii.

⁴ 'Acris et vehementis ingent.'—Jerome Catal.

⁵ De Patientiâ, ch. i.

tions.¹ In opposing these evils he writes with all the ingenuity and earnestness which naturally belonged to him. He withdraws the veil from the customs of the heathen to show the true character of the things in which Christians were taking part. Excepting that of the Roman satirist, there is nowhere to be found a more powerful exhibition of the iniquity of the unchristianised world than is given in his treatise on the public shows. Most forcibly does he point out, for example, the turbulence and immodesty of the theatres,² and the fierce and cruel passions which the scenes of the amphitheatre called forth.³ And perhaps no passage can be found which more powerfully appeals to men to abstain as Christians from scenes by which they may be led into sin, however much there may be of good intermixed with them, than the following, in which the evils of attending the heathen theatres are denounced:—

‘What would you do if found in such a place? Not as though you would suffer anything from the hands of men. No one would recognise you as a Christian. But think how your conduct is viewed in heaven. Can you doubt that, at the moment when you are present in the congregation of Satan, all the angels are watching you from above, and are noting accurately, one by one, who utters blasphemy, who listens to it, who is lending his tongue, who his ear, to the service of the devil against God? Will you not, then, fly from those seats on which sit arranged the adversaries of Christ? Fly from those chambers of abominations, where the very air which broods heavily over your heads is polluted with words of guilt. You will say that there is much that is pleasant, and entertaining, and harmless at the theatre; nay, that there are some things even most proper to be seen. Be it so. No one mixes up his poison in gall and hellebore, but in sweet and savoury cakes, and so introduces the poisonous drug amid the sweets. And the devil does the same. For he mixes up the deadly poison which he makes in the most pleasant and acceptable of the things of God.’⁴

It would have been well if he had confined himself to efforts for checking in this way any laxity or errors existing in the Church. But he could not be content with this. The strictness of life which he required of Christians drew upon him the

¹ *‘Alleguntur in ordinem ecclesiasticum artifices idolorum. Pro scelus! Semel Judæi Christo manus interlerunt; isti quotidie corpus ejus lacesunt.’—De Idol. ch. vii.*

² *Ibid. ch. xvi.*

³ *Ibid. ch. xvii.*

⁴ *De Spectaculis, ch. xxvii.* Compare the very powerful passage a little earlier in the same treatise, beginning, ‘An ille,’ ch. xxv.

ill-will of the clergy, as the words of S. Jerome would seem to imply. And hence he may have been led to seek elsewhere for that strictness of life and that sympathy which he could not find in the Church. And such a refuge offered itself at this time. Montanus, a native of Phrygia, had formed a separate community, professing (though, it would seem, only professing)¹ a greater degree of sanctity than appeared in the members of the Catholic Church. And in such a community the spirit of Tertullian found for a time a congenial sphere. Accordingly he withdrew from the communion of the Church, after having been a member of it only, as it would seem, for about five years.² Afterwards he withdrew even from the Montanist communion, and formed a distinct society of his own.³ Thus he deprived the Church of the benefit which his powerful intellect and earnest character were calculated to bestow. Thenceforth his history is for the most part lost to us; but his works remain, monuments of the history, and character, and ability of the man.

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer.—Such was the first writer on the Lord's Prayer. His treatise on it, written (it is thought) pretty certainly before he adopted Montanist views, and passed out of the communion of the Catholic Church,⁴ will well repay perusal. But it is unsuited for ordinary readers; for the great condensation of Tertullian's style, and his abrupt transitions from point to point, make it difficult to catch his meaning. Nor can any translation, however well executed, adequately represent the force of his original words. His treatise, accordingly, is one for the student and theologian, and should be carefully studied by them. In the brief pregnant comments on each portion of the Prayer, they will find much material for thought; short heads of matters suggested by the Prayer, or involved in it, which it will be for them to bring out into greater clearness and fulness, for the edification of others and themselves. It is published in the original Latin in the second part of Tertullian's works, edited by E. T. Leopold, and published by Tauchnitz, at Leipsic, in 1839. And in the translation of the Library of the Fathers it forms part of the first volume of Tertullian's works.

History of Cyprian.—‘Every student in his rambles in the neighbourhood of Cambridge has most probably experienced one walk and one day when, looking towards Ely from some

¹ See passage in Eusebius, v. 18, quoted from Apollonius.

² See Preface to Tertullian in ‘Lib. of the Fathers,’ Tertullian, vol. i. p. ii.

³ ‘Yet, we know not on what grounds, retaining those points of discipline which had originally recommended themselves to him, he separated from the Montanists, and formed a small local communion of his own.’—Ibid. p. iii.

⁴ See the evidence in favour of this given at the beginning of the Treatise in the ‘Library of the Fathers.’

'of the neighbouring heights, he has seen the dark blue monotonous lump which her ancient and magnificent cathedral heaves against the sky, suddenly burst forth distinctly into all its rich variety of tower, lantern, and galilee; and with such liquid clearness as to place him as it were on the spot. He might have watched with renewed delight several successive alternations of such obscurity and brightness ever as the sun broke forth with a vivid gleam, until at last a storm has suddenly come on and swept the whole object from view. Similar are the glimpses he will have of the African Church from the ground of Ecclesiastical History. He will see her suddenly emerge from the general obscurity in three bright bursts of distinctness, owing to the glory of her three illustrious sons, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine. After the last of these she is lost to his eyes for ever, in darkness, storm, and confusion.'¹

Such is the way in which the excellent biographer of the Early Church opens his notice of Cyprian, the next great writer on the Lord's Prayer. Born at Carthage, like Tertullian, just about fifty years after him, *i.e.* at the beginning of the third century, he was brought up to the profession of a rhetorician, and was not converted to Christianity till about his forty-fifth year,² when he added the name of Cæcilius to his former title of Thascius Cyprian, in honour of the friend to whom he owed his conversion. Once a member of the Church, he was soon ordained deacon and priest, and before he had attained the age of fifty he was chosen to be Bishop of Carthage, by the general desire of the people, but much against his own will, 'His signal merit being regarded as a warrant for dispensing with the Apostolical warning against such promotions of recent converts' (1 Tim. iii. 5).³

His Times.—But his lot was cast in troubled times. A long rest from persecution of nearly fifty years, joined to the natural tendency of the Carthaginian character, had produced its usual fruit of corruption in the Carthaginian Church. To the licence of which Tertullian had complained, was now added a spirit of insubordination and disobedience to the Church's rule. And the persecutions of the Christians under Decius, in the middle of this century, brought these evils out. Numbers yielded to the requisition that they should deny Christ, and either actually offered incense to heathen gods, or accepted a certificate from the magistrate to the effect that they had so conformed, although

¹ Evans, *Biog. of the Early Church*, vol. ii. p. 135.

² A.D. 245 or 246.

³ Robertson's *History of the Church*, vol. i. p. 108.

they had not really done so.¹ And equally difficult to deal with was the case of those who yielded, and that of those who stood firm. For the lapsed, as they were termed, had denied Christ, and had lost, with their uprightness, their position and self-respect. And the martyrs were in danger of losing their humility through the honours paid to them for their steadfastness in the cause of Christ. They were in danger too of being induced to confer too indiscriminately those 'pardons,' or recommendations to the merciful consideration of the Church, which, according to the custom of the times, their own superior merit entitled them to bestow on their weaker brethren. And Cyprian stands before our view, dealing wisely with these and other difficulties. His character was well suited to the times, combining as it did, in an unusual degree, the qualities of firmness, discretion, and love. Opposed to him was the hostility of a faction in his Church, headed by one Novatus, a member of a party to whom his election to the episcopate had been distasteful from the first. But he maintained his position firmly against his opponents, however they might shift their ground. For at one time they were for pardoning too readily the errors of the brethren, and then Cyprian maintained the necessity of preserving the discipline of the Church, and not receiving into communion lightly those who had lapsed. And when, by a change of position, they represented these errors as incapable of being pardoned by the Church, he opposed equally this undue severity. At the same time, he wisely discriminated the circumstances under which men fell, and made due allowance for the weakness which led to their fall. Thus wisely and diligently superintending his Church, Cyprian continued Bishop for about twelve or thirteen years.² In the persecution of the Christians under the Emperor Valerian, he was put to death, the great martyr bishop of the Carthaginian Church. He had been banished at first for a time by the Proconsul Paternus to Curubis, which Gibbon describes as 'A free and maritime city of Zeugitania, in a pleasant situation, in a fertile territory, and at the distance of about forty miles from Carthage.'³ But Galerius Maximus, who succeeded Paternus as Proconsul, ordered Cyprian to be recalled from exile, and brought before him. The description of the trial is thus given in the Proconsular Acts. 'On another day, the 18th of the Kalends of October, a great crowd was collected early at Sexti,'⁴ as the Proconsul commanded. And the same day Cyprian was

¹ Hence they were called Libellatics, as those who had actually sacrificed were called Sacrificates.

² Till about 260, A.D.

³ Ch. xvi.

⁴ Sexti is placed about four or six miles from Carthage.

'brought before him, as he sat for judgment in the court called 'Sauciolum.¹ The Proconsul demanded, "Are you Thascius 'Cyprianus?" Cyprian Bishop answered, "I am he." Galerius 'Maximus Proconsul said, "The most sacred emperors have 'commanded you to conform to the Roman rites." Cyprian 'Bishop answered, "I refuse to do so." Galerius, "Take heed 'for yourself." Cyprian, "Execute the emperor's orders; in a 'matter so manifest I may not deliberate." Galerius, after 'briefly conferring with his judicial council, with much reluctance pronounced the following sentence. "You have long 'lived an irreligious life, and have drawn together a number of 'men bound by an unlawful association, and professed yourself 'an open enemy of the gods of the religion of Rome, and the 'pious, most sacred, and august emperors, Valerian and 'Gallienus, have in vain endeavoured to bring you back to 'conformity with their religious observances. Whereas, then, 'you have been apprehended as principal and ringleader in 'these infamous crimes, you shall be made an example to those 'whom you have wickedly associated with you: the authority 'of the law shall be ratified in your blood." He then read the 'sentence of the court from a written tablet. "It is the will 'of this court that Thascianus Cyprianus be immediately 'beheaded."² Cyprian Bishop said, "Thanks be to God."

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer.—The gentle, loving, and devout spirit of Cyprian breathes in his treatise on the Lord's Prayer. It has a special interest as having been written probably during the visitation of the plague, which, to use the words of Gibbon, 'raged without interruption in every province, every city, and almost every family of the Roman Empire, from 250 to 265.'³ If the treatise was written at this time, it would have a special force, as the thoughts of Christians would be more readily turned to the duties and consolations of religion through the dangers both from persecution and from pestilence by which they were surrounded. And if it came before the notice of the heathen, they may have been induced to give attention to a Christian treatise by the conduct which the Christians exhibited during the time of the plague, and the contrast to the indifference of the heathen presented by the zeal and charity of Christian love.

The chief part of it is given in the Appendix at the end of Mr. Karslake's book. And no one who will be at the pains to read the passages which explain the several petitions of the prayer, taking

¹ Sauciolum was the Criminal Court.

² Proconsular Acts given in Library of the Fathers. Vol. containing Cyprian's Treatises, p. 21.

³ Hist. ch. x. end.

the passage on one petition at morning or evening, day by day, in the manner suggested in another place,¹ can fail to benefit by meditation on Cyprian's words. He will find his understanding enlightened as to the meaning of each portion of the Prayer, and as to the practical lessons taught in it. And his whole spirit will be incited to offer the Prayer in a more real and hearty way. The treatise of Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer may be regarded also as comprehending much of what is valuable in that of his predecessor Tertullian. For Cyprian was a diligent student of Tertullian's works. Daily he read some portion of them: and, when asking for the works of Tertullian from his amanuensis, his common expression is reported to have been, 'Da Magistrum,' 'Give me my Master.' And hence it cannot be doubted that, before writing on the Lord's Prayer himself, he would specially have made himself familiar with what had been written on it by the earlier commentator. The two treatises are, indeed, quite distinct and independent in matter, as well as in character and style. But still passages occur in Cyprian which agree with corresponding passages in Tertullian in a way which can hardly be accidental. Such, *e.g.* is the application which they both make of the parable of the rich man in reference to the petition for our daily bread. It may be well to give the words of both for the sake of those who cannot readily obtain access to the original works. 'But with good cause,' writes Tertullian, 'hath He added, "give us this day," seeing that He has said before, "take no thought for the morrow what ye shall eat." To which matter He hath also applied the parable of that man who, when his fruits were coming in, "thought within himself of building greater barns," and of times for long "taking his ease." On that very night he dieth.'² With this compare the words of Cyprian: 'Wherefore also God judges that rich fool, whose thoughts were for his earthly stores, and who boasted himself in the multitude of his abundant gatherings, "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" The fool made merry in his stores, even that night he was to die; and while life was ceasing from his hand, life's multiplied provision still employed his thought. The Lord, on the other hand, teaches us that he becomes the perfect and accomplished Christian, who, by selling all he has, and giving to the poor, stores up for himself a treasure in heaven.'³ The treatise is published in the original Latin in the second part of Cyprian's works, edited by Goldhorn, and published at Leipsic by Tauchnitz in 1839.

¹ In the Dissertation on the Interpretation of the Lord's Prayer.

² De Orat. sec. 6.

³ Treatise vii. sec. 14.

History of Origen.—Somewhat earlier than Cyprian, who has been placed next to Tertullian, as belonging like him to the Carthaginian Church, was Origen, a third great writer on the Lord's Prayer.¹ Unlike Cyprian, he was brought up in Christianity from his youth. His father was a Christian; and, before his son was quite seventeen, he was put to death in the persecution of the Christians under the Emperor Severus. Thus Origen was left with his mother and six brothers in a state of utter destitution, all the property of his father being confiscated to the State.² The earnest zeal of Origen showed itself even at this early age. He longed to offer himself as a martyr for the Christian cause; and being prevented by the care of his mother from doing this, he wrote to his father, strongly inciting him to martyrdom, and urging him not to deny the Christian faith for the sake of saving the family dependent on him. 'Take care,' he writes, 'not to change your mind on our account.'³ After his father's death he diligently continued the studies which he had all along pursued under his father's care. And hence he was counted fit to hold an important position in the Church when he was now only about eighteen years of age.

His Position and Times.—The catechetical school of Alexandria had been founded some little time before this. It was designed as a place for instruction in the principles of Christianity, and more particularly for the instruction of those who were brought over from heathenism to the Christian faith. Hence it was more especially important that those who presided over it should be conversant not only with Scripture, but also with heathen literature as well. It was to this position that Origen was appointed now: and his previous training exactly qualified him for the post; for he had been instructed in philosophy by Ammonius Saccas, the great eclectic philosopher of the time, and he had been taught the principles of Christianity by Clement, the second president of the school of Alexandria, of which Origen himself was now to be the head. And if Cyprian stands before our eye more as the gentle moderate administrator of the Church at Carthage, the mind loves to picture Origen rather as presiding over his Alexandrian school. We think of him as sitting, perhaps, day by day, and all day, ready to receive all who came to him for instruction and advice; now, perhaps, surrounded by his group of pupils, now meeting the difficulties, or enlightening the ignorance, of some single disciple. And what a solemn interest must it have given to his teaching, to feel, as he unfolded the great truths of the love of Christ, and

¹ Born about A.D. 185.² Evans, ii, p. 6.³ Ibid. p. 5.

the glories of the future world, that the effect of his teaching on the disciple might be tested as soon as he left his master's school, if some informer should declare the disciple to be a Christian, and so subject him to the hatred and rapacity of the heathen powers.¹

But this pleasing picture vanishes before long. In the course of a journey to Greece he had visited Cæsarea, and had there been ordained priest by the Bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem. How they should have been induced to confer on Origen the office which had been withheld by his regular bishop, it is difficult exactly to understand. But an entire change in Origen's position was the consequence of the act. He was compelled to leave Alexandria, and thenceforth we no more think of him as directing his school there. He withdrew to Cæsarea, the great seaport of the coast of Palestine. There he engaged in the superintendence of a school in place of the one which he had left. And there he found, in the friendship of the Bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem, some compensation for the loss of the many friends at Alexandria, whom the indiscretion of himself or others made it necessary for him to leave. To his teaching there he added the composition of many works. The most famous of these was his *Hexapla*. It exhibited in parallel columns the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and the same in Greek letters, together with the Septuagint and three other versions. And hence the name of *Hexapla* was assigned to it, from its exhibiting four versions of the Hebrew text, together with that text itself in the Hebrew and the Greek form. At Cæsarea he remained till the close of his life in the middle of the third century. In the persecution which raged under the Emperor Decius, and which has already been noticed as afflicting the Carthaginian Church, he was cast into prison among the numbers who suffered at that time. And though he was not actually put to death, he died from the sufferings to which he had been subjected, in his sixty-ninth year.² Possessed of great industry and an earnest ardent character, he has left behind him voluminous works. But his speculations, although striking, want the sobriety and certainty which alone could have given them a permanent value. Indeed, the views of Arius and other erroneous teachers have seemed to be supported by the writings of Origen. And, similarly, his view of Scripture as containing throughout a deeper mystical sense underlying the natural one, takes off from the value of his commentaries on God's Word. But they have their merit notwithstanding. And this has been fully recognised by one of the most careful commentators of our own time. 'Of the Patristic commentators,' writes Dean Ellicott, 'I

¹ Evans, *Life of Origen*, in vol. ii.

² About A.D. 254.

'have derived great benefit from some exceedingly valuable annotations of Origen, which are to be found in Cramer's Catena, and which have scarcely received any notice from recent expositors, though they most eminently deserve it.'¹

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer.—The treatise of Tertullian on the Lord's Prayer had a special interest as having been written probably before his separation from the Church. And that of Cyprian is associated with the great plague, and the exhibition called forth by it of Christian zeal and love. And the treatise of Origen in the same way has a peculiar interest as forming part of a treatise on prayer, addressed by him apparently to his friend Ambrosius,² together with a Lady Tatiana, of whom nothing more is known, though she has been supposed to be the sister of Ambrosius.³ Ambrosius himself was a man of rank, talent, and fortune, at Alexandria. He had been brought out of the errors of the Gnostic system into the light of the true Gospel by Origen. And from him in turn Origen derived not only encouragement in his labours, which he had from other quarters, but also, what he most needed, pecuniary means for prosecuting his literary undertakings, and what he was shortly to need, a steadfast support in the 'day of trouble.'⁴ There is much that is valuable to be found in the treatise on prayer addressed by Origen to him. And the chapters on the opening address in the Lord's Prayer, and on the petition, 'Lead us not into temptation,' supply many useful suggestions for the explanation and application of the Prayer. But the treatise is quite unsuited as a whole for the general reader: and Mr. Karlake, it will be seen, has thought it best to give only such occasional portions of it in the notes as illustrate or expand the remarks made in his Lectures. The petition, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' naturally gives scope for his tendency to mystical interpretation noticed before. A curious illustration of this mystical mode of explaining Scripture occurs in the sixth chapter of his treatise on the Prayer. Commenting on the words introductory to it in S. Matthew, he says, 'Many men pray "to be seen of men," and "stand praying in the corners of the broad streets," being lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God. For every one who is devoted to pleasure delights to walk in the broad way, and turns aside from the strait and narrow way of Jesus Christ, in which are no turnings and corners to be found.'

¹ Ellicott. Comm. on the Ep. to the Ephesians. Preface, p. viii.

² See ch. i. end.

³ So the Editor in his Preface to the curious early Oxford edition of the Treatise on Prayer, Preface, p. vi.

⁴ Evans, Biog. vol. ii. p. 26.

History of Augustine.—Of the next three great writers on the Lord's Prayer—Augustine, Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nyssa—Augustine, strictly speaking, should be placed last. But as he was so nearly contemporary with the other two, it will be best to place him next in order, as belonging, like the three preceding writers, to the African Church. Of his early personal history, unlike that of the earlier writers, we have very full details. They are too well known to be recited at any length here. But even those most familiar with them, may be willing to have the outlines of his early life recalled to their mind. Born at Thagasta, a city of Numidia, between Madaura and Hippo, in the year 354 A.D., he was taught at first in the neighbouring town of Madaura, and then sent to complete his studies at Carthage in his seventeenth year. From that time he lived an unsettled life. From Carthage he returned, on his father's death, to his native town; and thence he again returned to Carthage, and established a school there, on the loss of a friend whom he had dearly loved. From Carthage again he went to Rome; and from thence to Milan, where the great and good Ambrose was bishop at the time. This was the turning point of his life. At Milan he became a Christian indeed. He returned thence to Africa; and went to Hippo, which was near (as was said before) to his native town. There he was ordained Presbyter; and he was soon made Coadjutor to the Bishop of Hippo, in his forty-first year, A.D. 395. As Bishop of Hippo he remained for five and thirty years, till the close of his life in 430 A.D., his seventy-sixth year, 'having remained faithful' (as Dean Milman writes,) 'to his earliest, though humble see.' Some years before his death, Rome had been taken by the Goths.¹ And they now advanced against Africa, under Genseric, and besieged Hippo. But Augustine was spared the sight of the capture of the town. He died in the midst of the siege, and was taken away from the evil to come.

But it is not for themselves that these features of the outer life of the great Augustine have an interest, so much as for the history which underlies them of his inner life. At Carthage, to which, as we have seen, he was sent at seventeen, Augustine abandoned himself to the licentious habits of that dissolute town. But he was possessed of too powerful an intellect to be satisfied with merely sensual excitement. The Hortensius of Cicero led him to the study of philosophy. And philosophy, again, led him to feel the need of something which should satisfy deeper wants and desires. And the Manichean system

¹ By Alaric, in 410 A.D.

seemed to supply this. It attracted by the profession which it made, that none were required to believe except on full inquiry and satisfaction as to the truth of what it taught. The general principle of the system of Manicheism was the old Oriental one of the existence of two antagonistic principles—the one good, and the other evil. The good was essentially connected with Spirit, while Matter was evil. And hence the work of man consisted in disenthraling the Spirit from the power of Matter. Such was the general principle of Manicheism, which produced a marvellous and complicated system when interwoven with a vast mass of human and Divine truths which were corrupted and perverted by it. Its radical error consisted in this, that it regarded the Spirit as essentially good, and therefore not needing to be purified, and the body as essentially evil, and therefore incapable of purification. Thus it wholly divorced the two, instead of regarding the body as the instrument of the Spirit, to be used for evil or for good, according to the direction for good or evil given to it by the Spirit, its Lord.

It was by this system that the mind of Augustine, as of so many others, was held for a time, to the great grief of Monica, his pious, high-minded, and loving mother. It was as a Manichean that he lived at Carthage on his return there for the second time; and he remained the same at Rome. But at Milan, his delivery came. He heard the words of Ambrose, and was arrested by what he heard. And he was led through the good providence of God gradually on. The light of Christian truth shone into his heart. Conviction took the place of uncertainty. In place of a wavering state of alternate sin and remorse, came the firm resolve to dedicate himself wholly to the service of God. His mother, who had followed him to Milan, lived to witness his baptism, as a Catholic Christian, by the hands of Ambrose: and in all the serene happiness of her accomplished hopes and prayers, expired in his arms before his return to Africa.¹ His son Adeodatus, who died a few years afterwards, was baptized at the same time.² Augustine's remaining history has been already given.

His Position and Times.—The outer features of Augustine's life have an interest on account of the course of the inner life which underlies them. And the course of that inner life has a peculiar interest, because we can trace in it (as the devout student of biography ever loves to do) the preparation by God of a great mind to be the fit instrument for the work to be done at the time in which his lot was cast. The condition of Christianity now was

¹ At Ostia, on their way home. Tittlemont, vol. xiii. 12, in Robertson, vol. i. p. 365.

² Millman, *History of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 276

changed. It had been for three centuries the object of persecution—first to the Jew, and then to the Gentile; first to the populace, and then to the higher Powers in the state. And now at length it had been acknowledged by Constantine. It was now under imperial patronage, with the good and the evil which that brought with it. And one result was, that men had now rest and leisure for debating by themselves and with others questions which had been kept out of sight amid the anxiety and hardship of more troubled times. Was man, in his natural condition, necessarily, or almost necessarily, inclined to evil, as the Manichean would represent? Or was he, on the contrary, quite free and able to do right, with no natural tendency to evil, as Pelagius maintained? If God's grace was needed to aid man in his efforts to do good, how did it act, and where did the part of grace end, and the agency of man begin? And if it was God's grace that enabled man to do right, why was not its power all-sufficient? How could its success (to speak humanly) ever fail? How could it be that some men were brought to repentance and a holy life, while others, as it seemed, were lost for ever? With such questions the mind of S. Augustine was fitted, as far as any human mind can be fitted, to cope. He had held the Manichean system once. He was now a Christian indeed. He had known the deep tendency of man's nature to evil; he knew now the depths of the power of the sanctifying grace of God. And if his mode of meeting the difficulties of the time has its errors, they are the errors which probably must always result from an attempt—however necessary an attempt—to exhibit within the limits of a human system the infinite expanse of the dealings of God, of the spiritual workings of God upon the secret invisible spirit of man.¹

But his teaching has also a more practical use. These were his efforts to soar up to those mountain-heights, which are often covered with mist, while all below is comparatively clear. And it is in their teaching with reference to ordinary practical life, that the value of Augustine's writings especially consists. There are some who know well, in all its secret springs, the working of sin in the heart of man. There are others, again,

¹ 'Augustine' (writes Dean Milman) 'had rejected Manicheism: the antagonistic and equally conflicting powers of that system had offended his high conception of the supremacy of God. Still his earlier Manicheism lent an unconscious colouring to his maturer opinions. In another form, he divided the world into regions of cloudless light and total darkness. Within the pale of election was the world of light; without, the world of perdition; and the human soul was so reduced to a subordinate agent before the mysterious and inscrutable power which, by the infusion of faith, rescued it from its inveterate hereditary propensity, as to become entirely passive, altogether annihilated, in overleaping the profound though narrow gulf which divided the two kingdoms of grace and perdition.'—*History of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 268.

who know well, by deep experience, the blessed effects of the working of God's grace in the soul. But few combine both as Augustine did. He had both fallen deeply into sin, and had also gone far towards perfecting holiness in the fear of God. Accordingly he could, like a skilful physician of the soul, lay open the symptoms of each spiritual disease, and trace it up to its source through the intricate windings of the inner being of man. And he could also exhibit the treatment, and prescribe the medicine supplied by the Almighty Healer for each kind of sin. 'And hence' (as Dean Milman writes) 'his confessions, in which he describes the course of his own spiritual life, have become the manual for all those who are forced by their temperament, or inclined by their disposition, to brood over the inward sensations of their own minds; to trace within themselves all the trepidations, the misgivings, the agonies, the exultation of the religious conscience; the gradual formation of opinions till they harden into dogmas, or warm into objects of ardent passion. Since Augustine, this internal autobiography of the soul has always had the deepest interest for those of strong religious convictions; it was what multitudes had felt, but no one had yet embodied in words; it was the appalling yet attractive manner in which men beheld all the conflicts and adventures of their own spiritual life reflected with bold and speaking truth.

'Men, who shrank from the Divine and unapproachable image of Christian perfection in the life of the Redeemer, turned to the more earthly, more familiar picture of the development of the Christian character, crossed with the light and shade of human weakness and human passion.'¹

His Treatises on the Lord's Prayer.—There are many reflections upon different portions of the Lord's Prayer scattered up and down in Augustine's works; but his chief exposition of it consists of four sermons on it, addressed to the 'Competentes,' who formed the last of the classes into which the Catechumens were divided, consisting of those who were so far advanced as to 'seek' for baptism.²

There are two remarkable passages in these sermons, which illustrate the way in which the Lord's Prayer was learnt and used in the Early Church. Referring to the words of S. Paul, in Romans x. 13, he says—'Because then he said, "How shall

¹ History of Christianity, vol. iii. p. 273.

² Others, however, besides the Competentes, were present, as is clear from the passage in the third Sermon: 'And ye faithful, who, taking advantage of this occasion, are listening to this prayer, and our exposition of it, do ye wholly and from your hearts forgive whatsoever ye have against any.'

'they call upon Him in whom they have not believed?', ye have
 'not first learnt the Lord's Prayer, and after that the Creed;
 'but first the Creed, where ye might know what to believe, and
 'after that the Prayer, where ye might know Whom to call upon.
 'The Creed, then, has respect to faith, the Lord's Prayer to
 'prayer: because it is he who believeth that is heard when he
 'calleth.' And again, speaking of the use of the Prayer, he
 says—'Every day must the Prayer be said by you when you
 'are baptized. For the Lord's Prayer is said daily in the Church
 'before the altar of God, and the faithful hear it. We have no
 'fear, therefore, as to your not learning it carefully, because,
 'even if any of you should be unable to get it perfectly, he will
 'learn it by hearing it day by day.'

As each of the four sermons treats of the whole Prayer, they are necessarily more in the form of a commentary, for the most part, than a complete treatise. Each sermon contains, indeed, many valuable thoughts on the several petitions. But the commentary, being thus more or less fragmentary, is less suited for general reading than the more detailed and connected expositions of Cyprian and Chrysostom. Many of the more striking pieces have been introduced as illustrative passages in the notes to Mr. Karslake's Exposition of the Prayer. But there is much more left. And all, therefore, who would thoroughly enter into the excellent thoughts of Augustine on the Prayer, will do well to read the sermons through. They are given entire in the 'Library of the Fathers,' in the first volume of Augustine's Homilies on the New Testament.

History of Chrysostom.—Nearly contemporary with S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom was unlike him in all respects—in his early history, his character, his position, and his end. Born at Antioch, about the year 347, seven years before S. Augustine, he was brought up by the loving nurture of his pious mother, Anthusa, to a holy Christian life. Libanius, the great teacher of rhetoric at the time, numbered him among his pupils, and trusted to have in him a powerful maintainer of that philosophy and literature which he loved himself. But John was to obtain the name of Chrysostom, or 'the golden mouthed,' as the eloquent exponent of truths higher than Grecian sages had ever attained to. Meletius, bishop of Antioch, marked the powers of the youth, instructed him more deeply in Christian truth, and appointed him a Reader in the Church. For a moment it seemed as if that Church was to lose the active service of this soldier of the Cross; as if his gifts of eloquence were but to be as flowers

'Born to blush unseen,
 And waste their sweetness on the desert air.'

The retirement from the turmoil and sin of the heathen world, and the opportunities for undivided communion with God, which the hermit life held out, attracted many of the more earnest spirits of that time; and for Chrysostom, too, it had a charm. He would go into some monastery in the Syrian desert, and there consecrate himself to God. For a while, indeed, he was restrained from carrying out his purpose by the urgent entreaties of his mother, whom the loss of her husband had made dependent on the companionship and solace of her son. 'Wait, at least,' are her touching words, 'wait, at least, for my death: perhaps I shall depart before long. When you have laid me in the earth, and reunited my bones to those of your father, then travel wherever thou wilt, even beyond the sea; but, as long as I live, endure to dwell in my house, and offend not God by afflicting your mother, who is, at least, blameless towards thee.' He refrained for a time, in compliance with his mother's request. But eventually, perhaps after her death, he carried out his plan, and withdrew into one of the monasteries in the neighbourhood of Antioch. But he was not to be thus lost to the service of the Church. Again he returned before long to the duties of active life; and events soon occurred at Antioch by which all his eloquence and earnest piety were called forth.

In one of those sudden tumultuous insurrections (to use the words of Dean Milman)¹ which take place among the populace of large cities, Antioch had resisted the exorbitant demands of a new taxation, maltreated the Imperial officers, and thrown down and dragged about, with every kind of insult, the statues of Theodosius, his Empress, and his two sons. And then there followed the stupor of fear as to the consequences of this outbreak of popular rage. The aged Bishop Flavianus, who had now succeeded Meletius, went forth to appease, if it should be possible, the Emperor's wrath. And on Chrysostom, who was now a Presbyter, fell the task of consoling, and encouraging, and exhorting the people during the season of terrible suspense. And all the comfort which Divine truth, set forth with all the eloquence of oratory and the force of an earnest spirit, could supply, was afforded by Chrysostom to the crowds who flocked to listen to his words. And at length the happy answer came. The arguments of Flavianus to the Emperor had prevailed. Theodosius had consented to declare himself a Christian—an imitator of Christ—indeed. The Saviour had forgiven those who crucified Him. He would learn the lesson of the Cross. He, too, would forgive.

¹ Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 211.

His Position and Times.—We have thus far regarded Chrysostom as filling a post for which his powers exactly suited him; as consoling, animating, directing an afflicted Church. Here sorrow had done its work, and the exhortations and reproofs of Chrysostom fell on a soil prepared to receive the seed. But he was now to be transferred to a more arduous post. Eutropius, who governed the Emperor at this time, had heard Chrysostom at Antioch, and resolved to have him as the bishop of the Imperial Church. Some stratagem, it is said, was necessary in order to withdraw Chrysostom from Antioch, where the people were deeply attached to him, and would not willingly have suffered him to go. In this way he was made Bishop of Constantinople, the city which was now the head of the eastern portion of the Roman empire, as Rome was the head of the western part.

It seems hard to say that Chrysostom was a man unfitted for such a place. Rather we ought to say that the place was one unsuited to the high unbending virtues of the man. In Constantinople the presence of the Emperor and his court cast into comparative shade the dignity of the chief ministers of the Church; and Chrysostom's views of the importance of the Christian priesthood would not allow of their being considered to hold a second place. The people had become accustomed to expect—at the same time, perhaps, that they censured—a certain splendour and extravagance in the mode of living of the Bishop; and Chrysostom inclined rather to a retired, and simple, and almost ascetic life. There were many, also, who still held the views of Arius in some form or other, not accepting the absolute divinity of the Son of God; and Chrysostom was the uncompromising maintainer of the orthodox faith. Hence opposition arose against him on all sides. 'All orders and interests' (writes Dean Milman) 'conspired against him. The court would not endure the grave and severe censor; the clergy rebelled against the rigour of the prelate's discipline; the populace, though, when under the spell of his eloquence, fondly attached to his person, no doubt in general resented his implacable condemnation of their amusements. The Arians, to whom, in his uncompromising zeal, he had persuaded the Emperor to refuse a single church, though demanded by the most powerful subject of the empire, Gainas the Goth, were still, no doubt, sufficiently powerful.'¹

Thus the embers were smouldering, and a slight breath sufficed to fan them into a flame. 'Of all his adversaries the most dangerous, the most persevering, and the most implacable were those of his own order and his own rank.'² Theophilus, the

¹ History of Christianity, vol. iii. p. 226.

² Ibid.

bishop of Alexandria, led the attack. He was indignant with Chrysostom, professedly because he had received and treated kindly some monks of Nitria, who had taken refuge in Constantinople from the persecution of Theophilus, their regular bishop; really, probably, the jealousy which existed between the two great rival sees of the East led him to take so prominent a part in the opposition to Chrysostom. A council, over which he presided, was held at a place called the Oak, in the neighbourhood of Constantinople. Chrysostom refused to recognise its authority and appear before it. He was accordingly condemned; and, yielding to the wishes of his friends, he withdrew to the opposite side of the Bosphorus. But an earthquake which occurred on the night of the following day spread consternation among his enemies; and the Empress Eudoxia, who was one of them, desired his instant return. He returned; boats swarmed on the waters of the Bosphorus to accompany him back, and the multitude of the city met him with every demonstration of respect and joy. But his prosperity was short-lived. The same causes were at work as before, and they issued in the same result. One address is said to have given especial offence. Speaking (it was thought) of the Empress Eudoxia under the name of Herodias, he exclaimed, 'Herodias is dancing: Herodias demands the head of John.' The wrath of the Emperor broke forth. His soldiers entered the great church of S. Sophia on Good Friday, and treated the sacred things with contempt. Chrysostom at length surrendered himself to them. He was immediately conveyed away by night, and was taken to Cucusus, a small town in the wild mountain district of Armenia. But even this was not thought to be severity enough. From this place of exile he could still exercise great influence over the Eastern Church. He was, therefore, to be removed to Pityus, on the Euxine, a still more distant and savage spot. He died near Comana, in Pontus, while on his way.

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer is an excellent one: the most valuable for general readers, we are inclined to think, of all the treatises written in early times. Brief, and at the same time very easy to be understood, and full of practical deductions from the Prayer, it is admirably suited to the needs of mankind at large. And if the treatise of Cyprian supplies the devotional element more, raising up the spirit and leading it to offer up the petitions one by one with a more devout and adoring tone of mind, the treatise of Chrysostom supplies the practical element, and shows what should be the conduct in daily life of those who would worthily offer the Prayer. It, too, is given in the 'Library of the Fathers,' and forms part of the first volume of the Homilies of Chrysostom on the Gospel

of S. Matthew. It is given also, with some slight abbreviation, in the appendix of passages for daily reading at the end of Mr. Karslake's book.

Gregory of Nyssa.—His History and Character.—Far less known to fame than the other two great men who have just been noticed, was Gregory of Nyssa, another writer on the Lord's Prayer. He was born somewhat earlier than either Chrysostom or Augustine, and should, in the strict order of time, have been placed before them. His parents lived in Cappadocia; and at Cæsarea, a town of that district of Asia Minor, he was born about the year 321. After having had, no doubt, a good education, like his brother Basil, he was appointed a reader in the Church. But his great inclination for the profession of rhetorician had nearly withdrawn him from the ministry of the Church, when the touching and beautiful letters of Gregory Nazianzen, the devoted friend of his brother Basil, recalled him to his higher post. When Basil became Archbishop of Cæsarea, he called his brother Gregory to assist him in the duties of his see. But on the bishopric of Nyssa, a small city of Cappadocia, near Lesser Armenia, becoming vacant in the following year, Basil gave up the pleasure and benefit of his brother's society, and consecrated him to it, choosing rather to give him a post in which he might be more extensively useful, than to retain him near himself. This was in the year 372.

His Position and Times.—Two great speculative difficulties seem to have been felt, more or less, all along in the Christian Church. One, 'How can the Divine and Human Nature be combined in the one Person of the Son of God?' The other, 'How is the absolute Deity of Christ compatible with the Unity of the Godhead?' The errors of Arius and others, which had arisen from an attempt to solve this last difficulty, or rather to remove it, by denying to Christ the very same Deity which belonged to the Father, had been opposed in the great council held at Nice in 321. It had been maintained there that Christ was verily *of one nature with the Father*; that He was indeed included in the same essential Deity with the Father, and yet was in Person different from Him. But the Arian opinions still continued to exist. Sometimes assuming one form, and sometimes another; now triumphant in one quarter, now defeated in another, they succeeded, during the whole of the fourth century, in agitating the Church. And as Athanasius stands out as the leader of those who maintained the orthodox doctrine at the council of Nice, and for many years after it, so Gregory of Nyssa was one of the group of chief men who carried on the opposition to the erroneous views after Athanasius was dead. He was

banished, in consequence, by the Emperor Valens for a time, but was recalled by Gratian upon the death of Valens, and restored to his see in the year 378. Three years later, A.D. 381, a great council was held at Constantinople, and Gregory of Nyssa was one of the leading members of it. The denial of the Absolute Deity of the Son had been extended by Macedonius to the Holy Spirit, and the council accordingly added the clauses relating to the Holy Spirit to the Nicene Creed. Thus it was brought at this time into its present form, with the exception of its expressing the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only, and not from the Son, the words 'and the Son,' not having been added till the Council of Toledo in 589. In this council, Gregory is represented as taking an active part. He took up with him to it his work written to oppose the errors of the Arian Eunomius, and read it in the presence of Gregory Nazianzen and Jerome. Basil was no longer living to enjoy the satisfaction of listening to his brother's work. Once more Gregory appears as taking part in the later Council of Constantinople in 394. In the last year of the century he passed away, having reached his sixty-ninth year.

One remarkable episode in the life of Gregory of Nyssa deserves to be touched on, as illustrating the condition of the times in which he lived.

When the urgent appeal of Gregory Nazianzen had induced him to return and devote himself to the ministry of the Church, one of his first acts was to go and pay a visit to his sister Macrina. 'That affectionate and zealous sister' (writes the author of the 'Life of Gregory' in the biographical series of Dr. Hook), 'after devoting the bloom of her youth to the care of her brothers, employed her advancing years in guiding a small company of holy women in the paths of a heavenly life, on the banks of the Irus, amid the seclusion of the forests of Pontus, already consecrated to devotion by the labours of her brother Basil.' Such is the glimpse we obtain of the manner in which the Church of Christ was nurtured in secret in those early times. The life of his brother Basil, indeed, supplies a more complete picture of the life passed by those who thus withdrew into retirement for the cultivation of the Christian character, apart from the cares and temptations of the world. But in this slight sketch of his sister's life, we have a glimpse of one, on whom the difficulties of such a life would press more heavily, retiring from the charm and excitement of the world, and consecrating herself to the work of training up herself and others in the paths of a holy Christian life. Such was one form of the labour, for God's service, to which Christian piety

devoted itself in the times of danger and temptation of the early Church.

His Treatise on the Lord's Prayer.—The treatise of Gregory of Nyssa on the Lord's Prayer is more full and complete than that of any of the other early writers upon the Prayer. But this very fulness, while it makes the treatise a most valuable one for study, makes it also difficult to give any adequate idea of it. For it is of far too great a length to be reproduced, more or less entire, in the way in which the treatises of Cyprian and Chrysostom are given in the appendix of Mr. Karlake's book. And though many most striking passages might be extracted from it, such as that on the Duties involved in calling God 'Father,' which is given in a note on the first Lecture, yet these passages, to be fully appreciated, should be read in the 'Orations' of which they form a part. The orations have not yet been translated into English, so far we are aware. But in the original Greek they will be found in the beautifully printed edition of the works of the Fathers, by Migne.

Recapitulation.—With Gregory of Nyssa the sketch of the early literature of the Lord's Prayer naturally concludes. The next great writer on the Prayer was S. Bernard; but in his time the aspect of things was greatly changed. We have passed, when we come to him, out of that complex social, and ecclesiastical, and religious state which makes up our mental picture of the condition of the Early Church. The six writers who have thus far passed under review, have a certain unity. But at the same time, they have much of diversity too. Amid much that was common to them all, there has been much of variety in their characters and times. We have seen the Church at rest in the time of Tertullian, at the close of the second century. The times of Origen and Cyprian have exhibited the persecutions which it endured from the Roman power in the third century, with the differences respecting matters of discipline which those persecutions called forth within the pale of the Church itself. Then, passing on to the fourth century, we have had the condition of the clergy in the capital of the East; the rivalry which occasionally existed between the bishops of the most important sees; and the interference of the Emperor in the affairs of the Church, illustrated by the life of Chrysostom. The speculative differences by which the Church was divided, were brought out by the times of Gregory of Nyssa. And lastly, the Church is seen, in the later days of Augustine, sharing with the empire in the afflictions caused by the incursions of the Gothic tribes.

And very different, too, have been the personal histories, and characters, and attainments of the men themselves. How great

is the difference between the stern and lofty Tertullian, the wise and gentle Cyprian, the enthusiastic Origen, the long-wavering, but at last devoted Augustine, the eloquent Chrysostom, the refined and copious Gregory of Nyssa! Truly God employs builders of various character to rear the superstructure of Christian truth, even as He gave to various master-builders the Divine wisdom whereby the foundations were to be laid. Each of the six writers contribute much that is valuable in explanation of the Lord's Prayer. But their writings are suited for different readers. The obscurity of the style of Tertullian, the inequality of Origen, the fragmentary character of the treatises of Augustine on the Lord's Prayer, and reversely, the copiousness of the writing of Gregory of Nyssa, make their expositions less suited for the general reader than for the student and theologian. By these latter, they should be studied and digested carefully; and there are many passages which may most profitably be selected for illustration from each. But the treatises of Cyprian and Chrysostom may be read throughout with profit by every devout and thoughtful mind. They are given, with some slight abbreviation, in the appendix at the end of Mr. Karlake's book.

ART. IV.—1. *Replies to 'Essays and Reviews.'* By the (I.) REV. E. M. GOULBOURNE, D.D. (II.) REV. H. J. ROSE, B.D. (III.) REV. C. A. HEURTLEY, D.D. (IV.) REV. W. J. IRONS, D.D. (V.) REV. G. RORISON, M.A. (VI.) REV. A. W. HADDAN, B.D. (VII.) REV. CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D. *With a Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD; and Letters from the Radcliffe Observer and the Reader in Geology in the University of Oxford.* Oxford and London: J. H. and J. Parker. 1862.

2. *Aids to Faith; a Series of Theological Essays.* By SEVERAL WRITERS. Edited by WILLIAM THOMSON, D.D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. London: John Murray. 1861.

It is no disparagement to the two principal volumes that have appeared in reply to the 'Essays and Reviews,' nor does it imply any disrespect towards the eminent persons who have furnished their respective contributions to them, to say that we do not anticipate any great or immediate results from them. The excitement caused at the time when the notice in the *Quarterly* first brought the 'Essays' into prominence has long since subsided. It has long since been acknowledged that the statements contained in them were neither new, nor their arguments profound; and friends and foes alike have before now been obliged to admit that they have proved a failure. They have failed in carrying the mind of the English people with them. In spite of the immense advantage they have enjoyed from the celebrity of some of their authors, from the unexpectedness of the quarter from which such an attack upon Christianity has come; from the very extraordinary favour with which liberal measures and latitudinarian sentiments are at the present moment received, and, we may add, the reality of many of the difficulties, suggested probably for the first time to many readers on the perusal of this volume—the 'free handling' has not obtained any considerable amount of popularity. It must not, of course, hastily be inferred that there was no necessity for such notices and replies as have from time to time issued from the press. It was very natural that such unscrupulous statements as were made, and such monstrous claims as were implied in their authors' wishing to retain the position and emoluments in the English Church which most of them held, should have raised a storm of indignation, and it was further to be expected

that such feelings would find vent in a sort of guerilla warfare—one writer taking up for investigation such points as seemed most offensive, another devoting his attention to the showing up the fallacies which his own particular line of reading enabled him most easily to expose—whilst some would find a relief to their feelings, in protesting against the falsehoods, or gain-saying the flimsy reasonings which abound throughout the volume. The number of these productions has no doubt been much increased by the extraordinary unanimity of public disapprobation which the authors of *'Essays and Reviews'* have incurred. There are many who would have been on the other side if there had been the faintest appearance of any large or influential section of society adopting the views and conclusions of these gentlemen. We do not think the adherence of any such ephemeral friends at all a matter of congratulation. Truth can afford to dispense with any such defenders, nor need the fact be otherwise alluded to here, than in the light of exhibiting the imbecility of the writers in question, and their entire ignorance of the real state of feeling in English society. We do not give them credit for wanting to make martyrs of themselves for the sake of spreading sceptical opinions through the country, and so we are bound to suppose they expected a more favourable verdict than they have obtained. It is an undeniable fact, that with the exception of the countenance afforded them by personal friends, they have met with no approbation except from infidel or semi-infidel publications. Had this state of things been anticipated, it is possible the two volumes whose titles are placed at the head of this article would never have been projected. As it is, the controversy is well-nigh dead, and before what we are now writing appears in print, the volumes entitled *'Aids to Faith,'* and *'Replies to Essays and Reviews'* will appear amongst Mr. Mudie's list of half-price books, and copies of them will for the most part have ceased to circulate. The particular controversy excited by the volume in question will have been set at rest; the general issue between the Church and Unbelief, the arguments of which latter side appeared condensed and popularized in the *'Essays and Reviews,'* will remain pretty much where it was before. And now the opinion which we ventured to give at the commencement of this paper will be intelligible. As definite answers to the different Essays, these two volumes will have little weight. Whatever there is of value in them will tell both immediately upon intelligent and thoughtful persons, and indirectly in guiding others, and suggesting sources of information on questions which the *'Essays and Reviews'* have for the first time brought before the notice of a large number of miscellaneous readers. As our

readers then will have anticipated, we much prefer the form into which the volume entitled '*Aids to Faith*' has been cast, to the direct attack which is made in the seven answers to the seven Essays. Many reasons for our preference will at once occur; but they for the most part resolve themselves into the idea of the disadvantage of position occupied by one who defends an intellectual post which has been attacked. People will, however unreasonably, expect to find a solution of all the doubts and difficulties suggested to their minds by the essayists, and the writer who professes to make a reply, almost engages by the very terms he uses to establish the contradictory of his opponent's thesis. Now if the Essays had been written in concert as a joint and systematic attack on the doctrines of Revelation, and the evidence by which they are established, it might have been possible or easy for seven writers to combine for the purpose of exposing the fallacies of the Essays or the weakness of their authors. But the case is widely different, when, as in this instance, the writers embrace very wide differences of opinions, from a firm belief in some of the fundamental doctrines of the Church down to an absolute disbelief in the personality of God. Some passages of the Essays contain truths which are recognized by every body, some again, matters of doubtful credit; others speak definitely, others very vaguely, so as to leave it quite uncertain what the author means or believes. Again, objections may be raised against the facts alleged or the arguments adduced in their support; in the abstract an exception may be taken on the ground of the inconsistency of attempting to reconcile a belief in the Bible, or again a profession of Churchmanship, with disbelief of plain implications in the former or still plainer statements in the latter. Again, it may happen that a whole Essay may contain nothing very palpably erroneous or mischievous; the answer to it may be very good, and very much to the point; yet may perhaps convey an impression of carping unnecessarily at allowable differences of opinion. On this ground a direct reply to Dr. Temple's Essay seems to us a mistake. It does not contain as a whole, anything more than an absurd and fanciful and palpably erroneous theory; but such theory does not impugn the faith once delivered to the saints. It strikes us that the best thing that can be said of Dr. Temple's Essay is, that it is the production of an immature mind, scarcely reaching above a schoolboy's essay; and the worst, that it appears in such very bad company. And so we should have been content to leave it alone, being quite convinced that had it appeared as a separate publication, it would have attracted no attention whatever, that it would have fallen dead from the press, and probably have taught its author by its failure not to

venture into print again till he had something more worth the hearing to tell us, or something less heavy to amuse his readers with.

There is one other very important advantage possessed by the volume issued under the superintendence of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. As its name imports, it offers assistance to those whose faith stands in need of confirmation; and though it does not often openly challenge the positions of the essayists, yet it has in view the state of vacillation as regards matters of faith which the Essays have either found or created. It is scarcely controversial enough to run the risk of being found fault with by friendly parties, whilst the other volume must be content to be criticised on the ground of any portion of it being found inadequate to the task undertaken. The 'Replies to Essays and Reviews' occupy a volume which looks like a smart bookseller's publication; the 'Aids to Faith,' on the contrary, have somewhat of the unity that might be expected to pervade a work which is the product of a single mind. There is scarcely one of the 'Replies' that is all we could wish, whilst the 'Aids to Faith,' perhaps, with the exception of the Bishop of Cork's Essay, all supply some information, or, at least, some material for thought.

To Dr. Wordsworth's Essay we shall make no further allusion than to say that it exposes a few of the more palpable of the blunders made by Mr. Jowett, but leaves the main question of the interpretation and inspiration of Holy Scripture very much where Mr. Jowett leaves it; the differences of opinion respecting the former still require the same effort of thought to be appreciated; and the subject of inspiration is not at all clearer to our minds after the perusal of Dr. Wordsworth's Essay than it was before we began it. We did not at all expect that it would be. We shall recur to the subject presently when we notice Dean Ellicott's 'Strictures on Scripture and its Interpretation.' We are not disappointed that neither of these writers has elaborated any definite theory of inspiration, because we think that no such theory is possible; but we regret that a writer who is evidently entirely satisfied with his own view of the case, and has probably a definite theory of Inspiration, has not contributed more to the solution of doubts and difficulties suggested by his opponents.

Of the remaining six Replies in this volume we forbear to notice Dr. Goulburn's and Mr. Haddan's, except to acknowledge the singular ability and fulness of the latter paper, on the ground that the Essays by Dr. Temple and Mr. Pattison do not seem to us to require a systematic answer. We have before now, in this Review, commented upon both of these; and we repeat,

that little as we like or approve of the tone of either of them, and much as we doubted many implications in both, we do not think any direct reply to either was called for. Dr. Temple's paper contained a worthless comparison, worked threadbare, and Mr. Pattison's some valuable remarks on the controversial tone of the theology of the eighteenth century in England. The papers we have read with the greatest satisfaction, are those by Mr. Rose and Dr. Irons; and perhaps a short account of these may be interesting to such of our readers as have not been able to procure the volume for themselves, or have not time enough to spend upon the controversy between the Church and Infidelity. Mr. Rose undertakes to do battle with the critical school as represented by Chevalier Bunsen and Dr. Williams, his English expositor.

We will not enter upon the question how far Dr. Williams has made himself responsible for the views of Baron Bunsen, some of which he advocates, some of which he appears to dissent from, and of some of which he gives us no means of ascertaining what his opinion may be. The writer of the Reply considers that the argument is addressed *ad populum* rather than *ad Clerum*, and fairly observes that:—

'If any man addresses to those who have neither the leisure, nor always the acquirements, necessary to the prosecution of such inquiries, the most peremptory decisions on questions which have exercised the greatest philologers, and accompanies them with gross insinuations against those who differ from him; if he represents the state of opinion in Germany, and the course of prophetic exegesis in general, with the utmost unfairness, and attempts by such representations to bias the opinions of his readers, we may fear that he is likely to cause many, who are but slightly acquainted with these subjects, to make shipwreck of their faith. This is the *only* ground of fear. We have no fear that the truth of Scripture, which has borne for more than a thousand years the battle and the strife of man, will succumb under a puny attack like this. It has survived the assaults of Celsus and Porphyry, of Bayle and Voltaire, of Gibbon and Hume, and it is not very likely that it will fall by the hands of Bunsen and Dr. Williams: It is the unfair representations, the partial and the one-sided views of this Essay, announced *ex cathedra*, and coupled with contemptuous insinuations against those who hold the ancient opinions, which render it worth while to spend a moment in answering it. They may deceive the unlearned and the superficial, but there is really nothing in the Essay itself which adds a new argument to the old conditions of the great problem, or would give the smallest uneasiness to those who really know the history of Scripture criticism in Germany and England. These accusations may appear to be expressed in strong language, but if they can be substantiated they will shew that, however learned Dr. Williams may be, however capable of writing a trustworthy treatise on Scripture, the Essay he has ventured to publish in this volume is worthless as a guide to truth, and altogether unworthy of his reputation and his position. It is a very legitimate subject of inquiry to ascertain generally, whether the representations of this Essay, or Review, are trustworthy or not, and to that inquiry I now propose to devote my attention.'

—Replies, pp. 62, 63.

Accordingly, Mr. Rose proceeds to expose the misrepresentations of Dr. Williams under three heads. 1. The misstatement with regard to the acceptance of the German critical school of the alleged disproof of the genuineness of large portions of the Bible. 2. The misrepresentation of English writers upon prophecy, as gradually giving up the interpretation of prophecy as referring to a Messiah. 3. The misrepresentation of certain passages in Scripture. As regards the first of these three points, Mr. Rose meets the insinuations of Dr. Williams by simply stating the fact as it stands, and giving the names of well-known German authors who, so far from fearing any ridicule on the score of upholding orthodoxy, have successfully attacked the Rationalist school, a school which, as he observes, is never to be trusted for its facts when a theory is at stake. What is most, however, to the point is, the discrepancies in the opinions of these writers. From all that Dr. Williams has said, an unwary reader would be in great danger of supposing that, whether right or wrong, the German critics were at least unanimous in their opinion. Mr. Rose observes that it would be difficult to find any position maintained by one which is not destroyed by the rest. If any one wants to see this statement verified in a particular instance, we may refer him to the triumphant refutation of Rationalistic theory prefixed to Dr. Pusey's '*Commentary on the Prophet Jonah*.' One instance given by Mr. Rose will serve as a specimen of what is meant. The Song of Solomon, according to Gesenius, the highest philological authority of the critical school, must have been written at a time when the Hebrew language had been altered by an admixture of Chaldaic forms and phrases. On the other hand, Ernest Renan, a high authority on the Semitic dialects, assures us, that the same book must be at least as early as the tenth century before the Christian era. In fact, it would be easy to prove, if we followed German writers in their denial that certain books could have been written in certain centuries, that they never were written at all. Moreover, it is worth observing, that even Rationalist writers are beginning in some cases to decide in favour of the old established view, as, for instance, in Dr. Tholuck's '*Introduction to the Old Testament*.' With regard to English writers, Dr. Williams is equally ignorant, or equally unscrupulous in his assertions. The reader may adopt whichever hypothesis seems to him to suit the case best. First, he accuses Bishop Chandler, who 'is said to have thought twelve passages in the Old Testament directly Messianic.' Against this assertion Mr. Rose quotes from Chandler's answer to Collins, the following:—

'But not to rest in generals, let the disquisition of particular texts determine the truth of this author's assertion. To name them all would carry me into too great length. I shall therefore select some of the principal prophecies, which being proved to regard the Messias immediately and solely, in the obvious and literal sense according to scholastick rules, may serve as a specimen of what the Scriptures have predicted of a Messias that was to come.'—*Ibid.* p. 81.

The same sentence in which Bishop Chandler is attacked contains also an absurd misrepresentation of Bishop Butler and Paley, the latter of whom is accused of quoting only one prophecy, because he mentions one which is the clearest and strongest of all, and the former is supposed to have shrunk from the Messianic interpretation of prophecy, partly because 'literature was not his strong point,' and partly because he foresaw that the prophecies might all have their elucidation in contemporaneous history.

Both these points, as well as the third, are fully and patiently investigated by Mr. Rose, who by no means overstates the case when he recapitulates the results obtained. They are as follows :—

'1. That the author in his account of the present state of theological literature in Germany has entirely misrepresented its condition; that he has greatly exaggerated the achievements of the critical school, and appears utterly to ignore its miserable failures, blunders, and extravagances; and that either from his ignorance of the fact, or from a wilful suppression of the truth, he gives the impression that there is an almost unanimous acceptance of these views among the learned in Germany, while the real truth is that the rationalist cause is daily losing ground in that country.

'2. That in describing the course of prophetic interpretation in England, the author has entirely misrepresented the whole case. That he has specified three persons in particular as giving indirect testimony to his views, viz., Bishop Chandler, Bishop Butler, and Dr. Paley, and that in every case he has utterly misrepresented their testimony. Of Bishop Chandler's views he appears wholly ignorant; Bishop Butler's argument he has entirely misunderstood; and with regard to Dr. Paley, he has misrepresented his selection of one case only as a virtual abandonment of the rest, while the author himself expressly obviates in the strongest possible terms any such inference from this selection.

'3. That in the exegesis of particular passages the author has shown by the arrogance with which he treats those who differ from him, even in the most difficult passages, that he is either wholly ignorant of the weight of argument and authority against him, or unable to appreciate it; and that in order to favour his views he has in one case misrepresented the views of Jerome, and garbled his text so as to favour his misrepresentation; that he has attributed to Jerome exegetical absurdities on a very partial examination of his words, to which a further acquaintance with Jerome would give a very different colouring; and that no person desiring to know the truth on any of these questions would derive any assistance from the remarks of the Essayist, but, on the contrary, would necessarily derive a very false impression from them.

'4. That in regard to the interpretation of Isaiah lii., liii., the Essayist has given the highest praise to Bunsen for an interpretation which has very little to recommend it, and what he has exhibited in some particulars is flatly contradicted by the very passages adduced to prove it; that notwithstanding his

high praise of this interpretation, he rejects it himself, and yet most strangely endeavours to amalgamate it with two, if not three, other interpretations with which it is wholly incompatible; and that he has thus given to the world a specimen of utter incompetence in the interpretation of Scripture, which must take away all confidence in his opinions, until he shows that he has better grounds for them than any which he has hitherto put forth.

'5. That in regard to Daniel, the Essayist has done nothing except to assert a few of the oldest and the most commonplace objections to the genuineness of this part of Scripture; that he takes no notice of the fact that they have frequently been refuted, but brings them forward as if they were irresistible, only because he yields assent to them himself.'—*Ibid.* pp. 119—121.

We pass on to Dr. Irons' reply to Mr. Wilson on the idea of the National Church. This Essay commences with a masterly analysis of the changes which the theory of Natural Religion in England has undergone; and traces with great ability the rise of the Secularism or New Nationalism proposed by the writer of the Essay. Dr. Irons then proceeds to give an account of the theory itself which he professes to combat. Our readers who are not acquainted with the volume of *Essays and Reviews* may be referred to the account of Mr. Wilson's Essay given in the first notice of the work which appeared in this Review. Dr. Irons truly observes, 'that if that theory were accepted by us, and further acted out, it must involve the rejection of the entire 'Christianity of the Bible or the Church, ancient or modern.' The generalized Christianity which we are invited to adopt began by giving up parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, as being now recognized as of at least doubtful credibility. The next step involves the sacrifice of such words of our Saviour and His disciples as have endorsed these statements of the Old Testament. From giving up the words, the next step is easy to disbelieving the facts of the Gospel narrative, till the miserable residuum of belief is reduced to this, that there was such a person as Jesus, who lived eighteen centuries ago, whose history was written some thirty years after the events took place.

Mr. Wilson's idea really seems to be, that as to doctrine, the Apostles did not trouble themselves much about it, and for morals they were obliged to put up with a state of things far short of any ideal standard that might be thought of. We think we scarcely misrepresent him in saying, that he seems to regard individual immorality as a thing of little or no consequence, supposing the tone of the society in general be respectable. It seems monstrous that this idea of 'Multitudinism,' as it is absurdly enough called, should claim the support of the early Church.

Yet such is the claim set up by the author of this Essay, and to the examination of this claim Dr. Irons next addresses

himself. For those who wish to be furnished with the weapons fit to conduct the argument for themselves against the essayist and those who think or pretend to think with him, there is here supplied a complete armoury; but we will not insult our readers by drawing out at length what it was quite necessary for the author to do, the long line of well-known passages of the Gospels and Epistles, which entirely overthrow any theory like that of Mr. Wilson's, that the Church was constructed on a comprehensive scheme, aiming at the interests of this world rather than the concerns of the invisible world, intended rather to influence large masses of men in the way of civilisation, than to deal with the case of individual souls.

We feel that we owe a sort of apology to both these able writers for going so cursorily over their valuable essays, but we have no space, when so many have to be noticed, for giving a complete account even of those whose contributions appear to us to be most striking. There is one point in Dr. Irons' Essay which has pleased us much. He is the only one of the writers in these two volumes who appears to know that the contest is between the Church and the Infidel, rather than between the Bible and its opponents. Other writers may insist, and with good reason too, on the folly of the attack levelled against many different portions of the Bible. Each onslaught may have been vigorously repulsed—yet it is keenly felt that many individuals have been wounded or destroyed. This author alone appears to have grasp of mind to see that the only safety is the citadel of the Church; the principle of Protestantism has not much to fall back upon when it is rudely assailed as to the genuineness, the truth, or the interpretation of that Bible upon which it is content to stake its existence. It is an ominous defeat for Protestants to be obliged to surrender one of those texts behind which it entrenches itself as presenting an impregnable front for defence. It does not look promising when the most conclusive isolated text in the whole of the New Testament for the proof of the doctrine of the blessed Trinity in Unity has to be surrendered. But the Catholic Churchman can calmly investigate the evidence, and gladly acquiesce in the force of truth prevailing, because to him this sacred doctrine does not depend for its support upon any number of texts that can be adduced, but upon the concurrent testimony of the Bible, confirming the judgment of the Universal Church.

In opposition to Mr. Wilson's idea of accommodating the doctrines of the Church to the fading belief of half-educated people, and enlarging her comprehensiveness at the expense of her purity, Dr. Irons is hopeful, and even sanguine, as to the

prospects of the National Church. We could have wished to make many extracts from this interesting paper, but we must content ourselves with presenting our readers with its conclusion.

'Let no one imagine so vain a thing as that a practical people will tolerate a generalized "ideal of Christianity" as Divine. As little also will a free people bear any form of compulsory Religion. Yet will "the public" ultimately demand something more spiritual than its own "opinion." It will have an "historical Christianity." A narrow few may have already persuaded themselves to "give up the Church, and fall back on the Bible;" but what will they do with the "critics?"—Certainly they will need a learned clergy; and what then shall become of the fanatics? Will they do as they have done before,—avail themselves of the scholarship which shields them, and then go on awhile, until they need a fresh deliverance?

'But let us hope for better things. A noble spectacle it may be for the world, if this free land, with its illustrious Monarch and free Parliament, should teach observant Europe, that a highly educated Church may be trusted to fulfil her spiritual mission. A statesman really worthy of the name, seeing among our twenty thousand clergy some, and not a few, foremost in science, and all eager for the spread of real knowledge; seeing others (and they too not a few) giving their high gifts and hard lives to difficult enterprise for Christ's cause in the whole habitable globe; seeing, once more, the vast multitude of them engaged in the ten thousand villages of our nation, in life-long work for the Gospel,—such an one might believe that such a Church, freely and generously trusted, might make Christianity Catholic in our land. Our Church's character is marvellously "National" now; it is one with the people, even in its faults no less than its efforts; and it doubts not that its future, in the truest sense, shall be "National." Nor would it be less speedily so, but far more, if the Church were even as free as the judges in their proper sphere,—that sphere being *entirely* Spiritual.

'It will not detract from the National character of the Church, if her inner and spiritual affairs be untouched by the State.—Look at the ten thousands of English homes of which, in uncounted examples, it may be said in the touching words of an apostle, there is a "Church in that house!" Are they not the glory of the "Nation?" Have they no inner life beyond that which statesmen can regulate? Are they not "National?"

'And so, in a far higher measure, and with yet fuller authority and grace, the "Nationality" of our CHURCH OF ENGLAND, if she may do her own work, shall yet abide,—founded on the "hidden life" which CHRIST has given her, and sanctifying the souls of the people, for HIM who "purchased" them for His own.'—*Ibid.* pp. 274, 275.

Before going on to notice the other volume in this controversy, we must be permitted to say a few words on the Bishop of Oxford's Preface. It is, we think, to be regretted, that the Bishop's numerous duties should have prevented his reading the Essays which he recommends and in fact introduces to the world under the sanction of his name. Still the volume would have wanted something we should have missed if the introduction descriptive of the volume of *Essays and Reviews* had not been there. After noticing the insufficiency of the account of present views, which would characterize them all as

part of a reaction from the recently renewed assertion of the pre-eminent importance of dogmatic truth, and of primitive Christian practice, the Bishop continues as follows :—

'The rejection of the faith, which in the last age assumed the coarse and vulgar features of an open atheism, which soon destroyed itself in its own multiplying difficulties, intellectual, moral, civil, and political, has robbed itself now in more decent garments, and exhibits to the world the old deceit with far more comely features. For the rejection of all fixed faith, all definite revelation, and all certain truth, which is intolerable to man as a naked atheism, is endurable, and even seductive, when veiled in the more decent half-concealment of pantheism. The human soul in its greatness and in its weakness crying after God, cannot bear to be told that God is nowhere, but can be cajoled by the artful concealment of the same lie under the assertion that God is everywhere, for that everything is God. The dull horror of annihilation is got rid of by the notion of an absorption into the infinite, which promises to the spirit an unlimited expansion of its powers, with the misty hope of retained individual consciousness. Nor in this system is all former belief to be cast away at the rude assault of an avowed infidelity ; on the contrary, it is to be treated with the utmost tenderness. It is not even stated to be false ; in a certain sense it, too, is allowed to be true ; for there is nothing which is wholly true or wholly false. It is but one phase of the true—an imperfect, childish, almost infantine phase, if you will ; to be cherished in remembrance like the ornaments or the delights of childhood, only not to be rested in by men ; to be put away and looked back upon, as early forms which, as soon as the Spirit which had of old breathed through them revealed itself in rosy light, dissolved, like the frost-work of the morning beneath the full sunlight of noon. On this theory the facts of the Bible may be false, its morals deceptive, its philosophy narrow, its doctrines mere shadows cast by the acting of the human mind in its day of lesser light : and yet, on the other hand, it is not to be scorned ; it is to be loved, and honoured, and revered as a marvellous record of the God-enlightened man in his infancy, in the comparative obscurity of his intellect, in his youthful struggles, and reachings forth after the truth ; only it is not to fetter his now ripened humanity. The man is not to be swathed in the comeliest bands of his infancy.

'Thus no prejudice is to be shocked, no holy feeling rudely wounded, no old truth professedly surrendered. Rather, mighty revelations are to be looked for amidst the glowing feelings with which the past is fondly recognised and the future eagerly expected. Thus the pride of man's heart is flattered to the utmost ; thus the old whisper, "Ye shall be as gods," disguises itself in newest utterances ; thus in the universal twilight all the fixed outlines of revealed truth are confounded ; the forms of Christianity are dissolved into nothingness, and the good deposit of the faith evaporated into a temporary intellectual myth, which has played its part, done its work, and may be permitted quietly to disappear amongst the venerable shadows of the past.'—*Ibid.* pp. xi.—xiii.

The volume entitled 'Aids to Faith' is much more systematic than that which we have been noticing. We have said that it does not profess to take the 'Essays and Reviews' *seriatim*, and refute their contents. Rather does it contain suggestions which may be useful to those whose faith is at any point endangered by the existing state of scepticism around them. There is, however, one, the opening Essay of the series, of which it may be said, that the writer has engaged in single combat with

one of the essayists. That Professor Mansel has won so easy a victory over his opponent, is due, more to the weakness of the cause, than to the ability of the combatant; great as that ability has been shown to be, both in previous writings, and especially in the present 'Essay on Miracles as Evidences of Christianity.'

It has been reasonably objected, that apologists for the Christian faith have been content to argue the case upon the separate classes of evidence. People have been willing, for instance, to risk the credit of Christianity on the fact of accomplished prophecy, or on that of attested miracles. It is easy to see how much the cumulative argument for the truth of Christianity loses by this process. It is unwise to argue the case at such a disadvantage. Still more foolish is it to allow of the evidence for each individual miracle to be separately impugned. It might, for instance, be quite possible to take some one miracle recorded in the Gospels or Acts of the Apostles, and exhibit it as being either in itself incredible, or supported by small evidence; and it is easy to see what effect this would have on sceptical minds in invalidating the supposed evidence for other miracles. Dr. Heurtley, in his 'Essay on the Miracles,' has stated the case fairly as regards one of its aspects—viz. that the miracles are not to be treated as if they were facts, isolated from the whole Jewish dispensation, but rather as part of a large scheme, which carried with it an immense amount of evidence of its own. But Mr. Mansel has, over and above this, drawn attention to the fact, that miracles, quite independently of their evidential character, are part and parcel of the Christian Revelation, which cannot afford to part with them as evidence, because it is necessarily bound up with them, and must fall to the ground if they be denied. Independently of the Resurrection of Christ being a cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith, it is clear that the miraculous works of Christ and His Apostles profess to be supernatural. It is not as if the works had been done, and left to speak for themselves as to their own nature; they are done by their performers, who profess that they are supernatural, and if it can be proved that they are natural, the whole credit of those who worked them at once vanishes, and with it the Christian Revelation falls to the ground. We are not concerned here to represent this as an *argumentum ad hominem* merely, as if we had no other resource but to represent the inevitable consequence of the objection to miracles, and so to deter people from adopting it. It is otherwise a very important principle. Miracles must be regarded in two distinct lights; first, as evidential; secondly, as part of the Revelation. The position which Professor Baden Powell adopted in his Essay is utterly untenable. He wished to dispense with the evidence

of miracles, but to retain his belief in Christianity. It never occurred to him, that the very fact that Christ and His Apostles wrought these works, and appealed to them as miracles, is entirely destructive of the moral character of the workers, if it can be shown that miracles are impossible. This is the preliminary observation of Mr. Mansel's Essay; the whole of which is most temperately expressed, and we cannot but think has reference, in this respect, rather to the character of the writer, who is now no longer able to defend himself, than to the quality of the Essay. Perhaps it was, upon the whole, wise to abstain from ridiculing the poverty of argument shown by Professor Powell throughout his 'Essay on Miracles,' but we are quite at a loss to account for Mr. Mansel's designation of the writer whom he is criticising, as an acute author, on any other ground than the supposition that the whole of the following passage is a piece of irony:—

'See "Essays and Reviews," p. 141. It is astonishing that this acute author should not have seen the absurdity of introducing this statement in connection with testimony. No witness could possibly *see* two and two make five, or four, or any number, *in the abstract*; he must *see* it in connection with certain *visible* objects. Put the case in its only possible form:—let a man say that he had seen two balls, and then two more, put together, and five balls produced from them; and, instead of an impossibility, we have but the commonest of jugglers' tricks.'—*Aids to Faith*, p. 12, *note*.

We cannot think that Professor Powell has shown much acuteness in any of his recent publications; and the comparison between a case of testimony to a fact, and the assertion of an abstract truth, seems to us to indicate a mind utterly unable to understand the first principles of philosophy, and the elementary distinction between the truths of sense and the truths of intuition. However, we have no wish to find fault with Mr. Mansel for dealing leniently with an opponent whose conquest has been so easy. It would, perhaps, have been more curious than profitable to inquire into the character of the mind which was so led away by the love of inductive science, as to state its claims to certainty, in language far beyond what any philosopher has ever before ventured upon. Mr. Mansel's argument is throughout practical, and he has omitted to notice the extravagant and groundless claim for the certainty of inductive generalizations, even within their own sphere. The principal argument of the Essay is intended to represent miracles as occupying an entirely different standing-ground; but before we go on to notice it, we must not omit to remark the entire overthrow of one of Professor Powell's false assertions, which appears at first sight to be true, because there are so many instances to which it will apply with truth. The expression is as follows:—'No testimony can

'reach to the supernatural; testimony can apply only to apparent sensible facts; testimony can only prove an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable occurrence or phenomenon; that it is due to supernatural causes is entirely dependent on the previous belief and assumption of the parties.'

Mr. Mansel's reply is as follows:—

'Whatever may be the value of this objection as applied to a hypothetical case, in which the objector may select such occurrences and such testimonies as suit his purpose, it is singularly inapplicable to the works actually recorded as having been done by Christ and His Apostles, and to the testimony by which they are actually supported. It may, with certain exceptions, be applicable to a case in which the assertion of a supernatural cause rests solely on the testimony of the *spectator* of the fact; but it is not applicable to those in which the cause is declared by the *performer*. Let us accept, if we please, merely as a narrative of "apparent sensible facts," the history of the cure of the blind and dumb demoniac, or the lame man at the Beautiful Gate; but we cannot place the same restriction upon the words of our Lord and of St. Peter, which expressly assign the supernatural cause: "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you:" "By the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth doth this man stand here before you whole." We have here, at least, a testimony reaching to the supernatural; and if that testimony be admitted in these cases, it may be extended to the whole series of wonderful works performed by the same persons. For if a given cause can be assigned as the true explanation of any single occurrence of the series, it becomes at once the most reasonable and probable explanation of the remainder. The antecedent presumption against a narrative of miraculous occurrences, whatever may be its weight, is only applicable to the narrative taken as a whole, and to the entire series of miracles which it contains. But if a single true miracle be admitted as established by sufficient evidence, the entire history to which it belongs is at once removed from the ordinary calculations of more or less probability. One miracle is enough to show that the series of events with which it is connected is one which the Almighty has seen fit to mark by exceptions to the ordinary course of His Providence; and, if this be once granted, we have no *à priori* grounds on which we can determine how many of such exceptions are to be expected. If a single miracle recorded in the Gospels be once admitted, the remainder cease to have any special antecedent improbability, and may be established by the same evidence which is sufficient for ordinary events. For the improbability, whatever it may be, reaches no further than to show that it is unlikely that God should work miracles at all; not that it is unlikely that He should work more than a certain number.'—*Ibid.* pp. 7, 8.

After noticing that the miracles of the Old Testament can only be rightly estimated through their connexion with those of the New, Mr. Mansel proceeds to the real question at issue between the essayist and himself, which is 'the possibility of miracles,' with regard to which he truly observes, that the position of those who disbelieve in their possibility, is exactly the same as when the argument was stated by Hume, as follows:—
'A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature, and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire

'as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined.' As we have examined and exposed the fallacy of the argument from experience before now (see *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1857) we need not enter upon the subject again. We little thought, at that time, that the avowed infidel's argument would have met with the support of any one professing Christianity, much less of a clergyman of the Church of England. But it must be observed, that Professor Powell, though he has added nothing to the unalterable experience of Hume, has gone considerably beyond him in arrogance of assertion.

The progress of science has shown, it is said, beyond all reasonable doubt, that miracles are impossible. And the assertor of this comprehensive proposition claims to believe in the narrative of the New Testament side by side with the full conviction of the impossibility of the miraculous. Hume was at least consistent, for he used the alleged impossibility to enable him to disbelieve the facts recorded in Scripture. Professor Powell ought at least in common consistency to have shown that physical science was advancing in the direction of enabling human beings to cure disease by a word or a touch, to give sight to the blind, to raise the dead, &c. With reference to this, Mr. Mansel very acutely observes:—

'In one respect, indeed, the advance of physical science tends to strengthen rather than to weaken our conviction of the supernatural character of the Christian miracles. In whatever proportion our knowledge of physical causation is limited, and the number of unknown natural agents comparatively large, in the same proportion is the probability that some of these unknown causes, acting in some unknown manner, may have given rise to the alleged marvels. But this probability diminishes when each newly-discovered agent, as its properties become known, is shown to be inadequate to the production of the supposed effects, and as the residue of unknown causes, which might produce them, becomes smaller and smaller. We are told, indeed, that "the inevitable progress of research must, within a longer or shorter period, unravel all that seems most marvellous;" but we may be permitted to doubt the relevancy of this remark to the present case, until it has been shown that the advance of science has in some degree enabled men to perform the miracles performed by Christ. When the inevitable progress of research shall have enabled men of modern times to give sight to the blind with a touch, to still tempests with a word, to raise the dead to life, to die themselves, and to rise again, we may allow that the same causes might possibly have been called into operation, two thousand years earlier, by some great man in advance of his age. But until this is done, the unravelling of the marvellous in other phenomena only serves to leave these mighty works in their solitary grandeur, as wrought by the finger of God, unapproached and unapproachable by all the knowledge and all the power of man.'—*Ibid.* pp. 13, 14.

It is a singular fact that the argument against the possibility of miracles entirely ignores the existence of mind in the universe. If it be once granted that an individual mind exists

endowed with free-will, then it is certain that that free-will is perpetually interfering with the phenomena of the material universe. Here we may again be permitted to refer to a previous paper in this Review (see *Christian Remembrancer* for April, 1861). It was there observed that the alteration of climate in a whole island might depend on the caprice of an individual, according as he should or should not decide to cut down the trees and clear away the ground. And it may further be observed that the alteration of any one physical phenomenon undoubtedly has some effect, and may have a much greater effect than we at all suspect, on the facts of the universe, whether past or future :—

'Admit,' says Mr. Mansel, 'the existence of a free will in man ; and we have the experience of a power, analogous, however inferior, to that which is supposed to operate in the production of a miracle, and forming the basis of a legitimate argument from the less to the greater. In the Will of man we have the solitary instance of an Efficient Cause in the highest sense of the term, acting among and along with the physical causes of the material world, and producing results which would not have been brought about by any invariable sequence of physical causes left to their own action. We have evidence, also, of an elasticity, so to speak, in the constitution of nature, which permits the influence of human power on the phenomena of the world to be exercised or suspended at will, without affecting the stability of the whole. We have thus a precedent for allowing the possibility of a similar interference of a higher will on a grander scale, provided for by a similar elasticity of the matter subjected to its influence. Such interferences, whether produced by human or by super-human will, are not contrary to the laws of matter ; but neither are they the result of those laws. They are the work of an agent who is independent of the laws, and who, therefore, neither obeys them nor disobeys them. If a man, of his own free will, throws a stone into the air, the motion of the stone, as soon as it has left his hand, is determined by a combination of purely material laws ; partly by the attraction of the earth ; partly by the resistance of the air ; partly by the magnitude and direction of the force by which it was thrown. But by what law came it to be thrown at all ? What law brought about the circumstance through which the aforesaid combination of material laws came into operation on this particular occasion and in this particular manner ? The law of gravitation, no doubt, remains constant and unbroken, whether the stone is lying on the ground or moving through the air ; but neither the law of gravitation, nor all the laws of matter put together, could have brought about this particular result, without the interposition of the free will of the man who throws the stone. Substitute the will of God for the will of man ; and the argument, which in the above instance is limited to the narrow sphere within which man's power can be exercised, becomes applicable to the whole extent of creation, and to all the phenomena which it embraces.'—*Ibid.* pp. 19, 20.

The whole of this argument depends upon the assumption of the existence of a Personal God, of whose acts and purposes we may speak in language such as we use when we speak of the acts and purposes of beings endowed with free-will.

The evidence of such existence Mr. Mansel finds rather in the phenomena of mind than in that of matter. We cannot

entirely follow either Mr. Mansel, or Jacobi, from whom he quotes an interesting passage, the point of which is that 'Nature conceals God,' and that 'Man reveals God.' Yet the very strength of the mode of expression seems to point out the more clearly what is intended—that in judging either of the possibility or the probability of miracles, the principal evidence will not be derived from the laws of the material universe, but from the observation of the mind of man, and the relation in which it stands to that Creative Intelligence, of which it is the copy, and whose existence it suggests.

'It is altogether an erroneous view to represent the question between general law and special interposition as if it rested on mechanical considerations only,—as if it could be judged by the difference between constructing a machine which, when once made, can go on continuously by its own power, and one which, at successive periods, requires new adjustments. The miracle is not wrought for the sake of the physical universe, but for the sake of the moral beings within it; and the question to be considered is not whether a divine interposition is needed to regulate the machinery of nature, but whether it is needed or adapted to promote the religious welfare of men. If the spiritual restoration of mankind has in any degree been promoted by means of a religion professing to have been introduced by the aid of miracles, and whose whole truth is involved in the truth of that profession, we have a sufficient reason for the miraculous interposition, superior to any that can be urged for or against it from considerations derived from the material world. The very conception of a *revealed* as distinguished from a *natural* religion implies a manifestation of God different in kind from that which is exhibited by the ordinary course of nature; and the question of the probability of a miraculous interposition is simply that of the probability of a revelation being given at all.'—*Ibid.* p. 29.

We have only space for one more extract from this interesting essay, and, indeed, we have already dwelt longer upon it than we intended. Our excuse must be that it is by far the best essay in the two volumes which we have been criticising.

'The question, then, only requires to be disentangled of its confusion, to be very briefly answered. If it is considered theoretically and in the abstract, with reference merely to the logical character of certain doctrines in themselves, and not to the circumstances and needs of men, we may divide, as is usually done, the doctrines of religion into those which are and those which are not discoverable by human reason; regarding the former as prior to revelation, and furnishing a negative criterion which no true revelation can contradict; while the latter are posterior to revelation, and rest immediately on the authority of a divinely commissioned Teacher, and mediately on the proofs of his divine mission, whatever these may be. And it is at this stage of the inquiry that the question concerning the evidential value of miracles properly comes in. A teacher who proclaims himself to be specially sent by God, and whose teaching is to be received on the authority of that mission, must, from the nature of the case, establish his claim by proofs of another kind than those which merely evince his human wisdom or goodness. A superhuman authority needs to be substantiated by superhuman evidence; and what is superhuman is miraculous. It is not *the truth of the doctrines*, but *the authority of the teacher*, that miracles are employed to prove; and the authority being established, the truth of the

doctrine follows from it. In this manner our Lord appeals to His miracles as evidences of His mission: "The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." It is easy to say that we might have known Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, had He manifested Himself merely as a moral teacher, without the witness of miracles. It is easy to *say* this, because it is impossible to *prove* it. We cannot reverse the facts of history: we cannot make the earthly life of Christ other than it was. As a matter of fact, He did unite miraculous powers with pure and holy doctrine; and, as a matter of fact, He did appeal to His miracles in proof of His divine authority. The miracles are a part of the portrait of Christ: they are a part of that influence which has made the history of the Christian Church what it is. It is idle to speculate on what that history might have been, had that influence been different. We have to do with revelation as we have to do with nature,—as God has been pleased to make it, not as He might have made it, had His wisdom been as ours.'—*Ibid.* pp. 39, 40.

With regard to the remaining essays in this volume, we must confess that we are somewhat disappointed in them. We have nothing to object to the Bishop of Cork's diatribe on the Evidences of Christianity, but then neither do we feel that we rise from its perusal any wiser than we were before. The Bishop of Gloucester addresses himself to those who attach *some* preternatural efficacy to the Redeemer's sufferings for men, but propose to alter the terms in which it (we suppose he means the statement of it) is usually conveyed.

The passage at page 352, which exemplifies the writer's assertion that 'all the difficulties that belong to this question are introduced prior to it by a consideration of sin itself,' is the best part of the essay, but it only represents a view which any thoughtful mind must have formed for itself, that the difficulties of this subject, like those of all other parts of revelation, may be thrown in the teeth of the deist, who admits the existence of an infinitely perfect Being, and who is unable logically to reconcile his belief with the fact of the existence of physical and moral evil.

We will proceed to give a brief account of the principal historical essay in the series. Mr. Mansel undoubtedly bears away the palm for logic and philosophy, and Mr. Rawlinson is entitled to the same distinction in his own particular line of history. His object is not to notice any or all of the essayists, but to expose the weakness of all the attacks that have recently been made upon the Pentateuch, or, in his own words, 'to show 'first that there is no sufficient reason to doubt the Mosaic 'authorship of the Pentateuch; and, secondly, that there are 'no sufficient historical grounds for questioning the authenticity 'of the narrative.'

Mr. Rawlinson explains what he means by attributing the authorship of the Pentateuch to Moses, by stating the following qualifications—

'Before the final close of this portion of the inquiry, it will perhaps be best to state distinctly in what sense it is intended to maintain that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. In the first place, it is not intended to assert that he was the original composer of all the documents contained in his volume. The Book of Genesis bears marks of being to some extent a compilation. Moses probably possessed a number of records, some of greater, some of less antiquity, whereof, under Divine guidance, he made use in writing the history of mankind up to his own time. It is possible that the Book of Genesis may have been, even mainly, composed in this way from ancient narratives, registers, and biographies, in part the property of the Hebrew race, in part a possession common to that race with others. Moses, guided by God's Spirit, would choose among such documents those which were historically true, and which bore on the religious history of the human race. He would not be bound slavishly to follow, much less to transcribe them, but would curtail, expand, adorn, complete them, and so make them thoroughly his own, infusing into them the religious tone of his own mind, and at the same time re-writing them in his own language. Thus it would seem that Genesis was produced. With regard to the remainder of his history, he would have no occasion to use the labours of others, but would write from his own knowledge.

'In the second place, it is not intended to deny that the Pentateuch may have undergone an authoritative revision by Ezra, when the language may have been to some extent modernised, and a certain number of parenthetic insertions may have been made into the text. The Jewish tradition on this head seems to deserve attention from its harmony with what is said of Ezra in the book which bears his name. And this authoritative revision would account at once for the language not being more archaic than it is, and for the occasional insertion of parentheses of the nature of a comment. It would also explain the occurrence of "Chaldaisms" in the text.

'Thirdly, it is, of course, not intended to include in the Pentateuch the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which was evidently added after Moses' death, probably by the writer of the Book of Joshua.'—*Ibid.* pp. 251, 252.

After having shown in the introductory part of the essay what are in brief the internal evidences in favour of the Mosaic authorship—and laying down as a canon, that except for special reasons, books are to be assigned to the authors whose names they bear, from which it follows, as a logical consequence, that the *onus probandi* lies with him who denies the genuineness of a given book—he declines to examine the different theories of authorship and composition which have issued from the Continent during the last half-century, on the ground that until it is shown that the book was not composed by its reputed author, the mode and time of its composition are not fit objects of research. He then proceeds to the authenticity. And here perhaps we may be permitted to remind theological students of the different meaning of the two terms genuineness and authenticity. In investigating the genuineness we are simply endeavouring to ascertain whether a book was written by the author who professes in the book to write it, or by him to whom it has been by common consent attributed. Thus the *genuineness* of the epistles of Phalaris has been disproved by Bentley, as it is plain from chronological and other considerations that

they were not written by the tyrant of Agrigentum, whose name they bear, and who is alluded to in them as their writer. The disproof of genuineness does not necessarily affect authenticity except so far as it throws doubt upon the veracity of other statements made by a person who has been convicted of a single falsehood or a forgery. Even in this case the work may be authentic as regards the main features of its contents, though its authority as to facts may be considerably damaged by its having been proved not to be genuine; and in case of the examination of the authorship of a work which contains no internal evidence who wrote it, but which has been generally ascribed to a given author, the genuineness has absolutely nothing to do with the authenticity. Thus the Epistle of S. Paul to the Hebrews is authentic, but its genuineness may fairly be called in question—Bishop Bull, we think, never quotes it as the work of S. Paul—but uses the phrase *divinus auctor quisquis ille fuerit*. The question of authenticity is then a question whether a book can be trusted and relied on for its facts and assertions. It may be remembered, however, that there are cases where the destruction of the genuineness of a volume carries with it also that of the authenticity. For instance, the epistles of Phalaris are perpetually alluding to what the supposed author did and said. Of course, if the authorship is disproved, any assertions as to what such an author said or did, are, though not necessarily false, brought into grave doubt, and are not entitled to credit unless well corroborated from other sources. It is plain that in the case of the Pentateuch the disproof of the genuineness would entirely invalidate the authenticity of at least large portions of it, but the establishing the genuineness by no means affords conclusive evidence of the authenticity.

Accordingly, Mr. Rawlinson, having set aside the question of genuineness by having shown that there are no sufficient grounds for calling it in question, proceeds to notice the arguments which have recently been raised against its authenticity.

The six principal points of attack on the authenticity are first enumerated. The truth of the Mosaic narrative is impugned on the score of its defective chronology, the destruction of the human race by a universal deluge, the mistakes of an ethnological character, the genealogies, the lengths of the lives of the patriarchs, and the alleged incompatibility of the duration of the sojourn in Egypt with the respective numbers of the Israelites at the commencement and conclusion of the period.

The argument against Moses on the score of chronology really only needs to be stated in plain language to enable any

person possessed of an ordinary amount of common-sense to see its absurdity. It owes its paternity to that arch-impostor Baron Bunsen, who as yet appears in this matter to have no disciples. For the sake of unlearned readers it seems worth while to state that the number of years from the creation to the birth of Christ, which, according to the ordinarily adopted chronology, is 4,004, has been computed from the three different documents which we possess at an amount varying from 4,000 to about 5,500 years, and that Baron Bunsen places the date of the existence of the first man in 20,000 years B.C. and that of the deluge at 10,000 B.C. At first sight it is evident that these numbers, if they are to be regarded as trustworthy, must, be made up from early documents or monuments. Now whatever may be the errors that have crept into a document full of figures, and no documents, it must be admitted, are so liable to error, there is, to say the least of it, some probability that the Hebrew text of Genesis—that of the Samaritan version, and that of the Septuagint—will give an average amount of years that will not be very far from the truth. At any rate, if the duration of the race of man from the creation to the Christian Era is not about four or five thousand years, we seem justified in asking for some documentary evidence in support of a theory which assigns twenty thousand as the probable number. Well, in support of this monstrous theory, and in face of the fact that no nation has any historical beginning earlier than twenty-eight centuries before the Christian Era, in face also of the fact that no monuments of human construction exist of so early a date as that, we have M. Bunsen's assertion that the historic records of Egypt reach up to the year 9085 B.C. when a sacerdotal monarchy was established, Bytis the Theban, priest of Ammon, being the first king. Before this time Egypt had been republican, separate governments existing in the different nomes, and that Egyptian nationality began as early as B.C. 10000. And these preposterous conclusions profess to be derived from Egyptian records, and 'from the monuments and other records.' Let us see what these records are. The whole theory, then, rests upon a version of a history of Egypt written by Manetho, an Egyptian priest of the fourth century B.C. which represents the government of Egypt from the time of Menes to that of Alexander as being under thirty dynasties of kings, occupying 113 generations, or about 3,500 years. The difficulties connected with this computation are inseparable, as there is no method for determining which of these dynasties, and how many of the monarchs, were contemporaneous. The period before Menes was considered by Manetho as consisting of 24,925

years, a period which he calls supernatural, during which Egypt was governed by gods, demigods, and spirits. Such is Manetho's description, and over this elementary account Baron Bunsen waves his enchanter's wand, and 9085 B.C. is the mystic number which turns up for the commencement of Egyptian history. Precisely the same evidence which was presented to Baron Bunsen's mind appeared to Sir Gardner Wilkinson to point to 2690 as the probable date of the accession of Menes, whilst Mr. Stuart Poole assigns the date 2717 B.C. to the same event. The reader will cease to wonder at the apparent ease with which Baron Bunsen produces his large numbers when he has read the following note from p. 257:—

'One method, however, whereby M. Bunsen exaggerates his Babylonian chronology seems worthy of notice. It is the method of *mistranslation*. Philo Byblius having observed in his work about Cities that Babylon was founded 1002 years (*ἑρεσι χιλίους δύο*) before Semiramis, M. Bunsen renders the words in brackets by "two thousand years," thus gaining for his chronology near a thousand years at a stroke. (See his "Egypt," vol. iv. p. 414, and again p. 491.)'

We trust future panegyrists of the German critic, in estimating his acquaintance with language, will not forget this delightful specimen of Greek scholarship.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Rawlinson has not exposed at greater length the ridiculous assumptions by which Baron Bunsen attempts to establish his long periods in Egyptian history. Any one who would give an analysis of 'Egypt's Place in Universal History,' carefully noting what is fact and what is hypothesis, and pointing out the slender amount of premiss upon which the magnificent conclusion is based, would do great service to the student of history. Such a work, though it need not extend to any great number of pages, would exceed the limits either of an essay or review.

Mr. Rawlinson proceeds to notice the next great objection to the authenticity of the Pentateuch, viz. the narrative of the Flood. We do not think his account is here quite so satisfactory. We are inclined ourselves to the opinion that the Flood was partial as concerns the places and creatures overwhelmed and destroyed. It is sufficient for all purposes of theology, and it seems more consistent with natural history, to suppose that all the human inhabitants of the earth were destroyed with the exception of a single family. The attack rests upon very slight grounds, and we need not trouble our readers with noticing the reply. Passing by the notice of ethnological mistakes, so called, we proceed to the alleged mythical character of the genealogies. And here we shall let Mr. Rawlinson speak for himself.

'The mythical character of this same portion of the Biblical history has been further based upon certain supposed etymologies. Seth, we are informed represents, not a man, but God Himself, since Set or Sutekh was an old Oriental root for God, and Set or Suti continued to be an Egyptian deity. Enos is the same as Adam, since in Aramaic it means "man," as Adam does in Hebrew. Neither are real names of persons, but only ideal appellations for the first founder of our race. Enoch, "the seer of God," represents a religious period intervening between the time of the marauder Cain, and that of the agricultural builder of cities Irad. At the same time he is "the solar year," since the number of years which he is said to have lived coincides exactly with the number of days in that division of time. Cain and Irad are the respective types of the nomadic shepherd races and the agricultural dwellers in towns. The other patriarchs also represent epochs; and Nabor, the grandfather of Abraham, is the first real Biblical man.

It is clear that all history whatsoever may be made to evaporate under such treatment as this. If we may guess at etymologies, and then at once assume our guesses to be coincident with truth; if we may regard all significant names as mythic, and the personages to whom they are assigned as ideal, there is no portion of the world's annals which may not with a very little ingenuity be transferred to the region of myth. A witty writer noted some ten years since the certainty that, if such views prevailed, a famous passage from the ecclesiastical history of our own time would be relegated by posterity to that shadowy region; for how could it be doubted that such names as Newman, Wiseman, Masterman, Philpotts, Wilde, were "fictitious appellations invented by an allegorist, either to set forth certain qualities or attributes of certain persons whose true names were concealed, or to embody certain tendencies of the times, or represent certain party characteristics?" Similarly it might be argued that Athenian history, from Draco to Pericles, is mythical—that Draco was intended to represent the bloody and cruel spirit of the old aristocracy, Cylon their *crooked* courses, Solon the first establishment of a *sole* authority (for it would seem to be thought allowable to draw a derivation from a cognate dialect), Pisistratus the usurpation in which a chief *persuaded an army* to help him, Hippias, Hipparchus, and Thessalus, the time when, with the aid of *Thessaly*, the cavalry service was first fully organised, Isagoras the establishment of democracy, Clisthenes the *triumph of physical strength*, Themistocles the *ascendancy of law*, Aristides the completion of the *best form of government*, Pericles the age when Athens attained her *full glory*. Where names are significant, and their etymology is accurately known, it is generally easy to bend them into agreement even with the actual history of the time. How much more easy must it be, when their signification is unknown, to affix a meaning on plausible grounds which shall square with our historical fancies!—*Ibid.* pp. 273, 274.

Lastly, as regards the longevity of the patriarchs; the only account of facts we possess being that contained in the Book of Genesis, it seems rather absurd to say that such longevity is 'at variance with all the laws of human and animal organism.' This is just one of those statements which dabbblers in science are afraid to impugn, lest they should betray the fact of their entire ignorance of the particular science whose conclusions are so definitely stated. In the absence of any evidence really entitled to be called scientific, it may be worth mentioning that—

'In the Hindoo accounts there are four ages of the world. In the first, man was free from diseases, and attained to the age of 400 years; in the second the

term of life was reduced to 300 years; in the third it became 200; and in the fourth 100. The Babylonian traditions gave to their early monarchs reigns of between two and three thousand years. The Greeks told of a time when men were children till they reached a hundred. Pliny mentions a number of authors according to whom men had lived 300, 500, 600, and 800 years. Josephus relates that the Egyptian, Phœnician, Babylonian, and Grecian historians united in declaring that there had been cases of persons living nearly 1000 years. It seems to be quite certain that a very wide-spread tradition existed in the ancient world, to the effect that the term of human life had been greatly abbreviated since man's first appearance upon the earth.'—*Ibid.* pp. 578, 279.

The last objection is the unnatural rate of increase of the Israelites during the 430 years. And here we think there is no necessity to adopt the suggestion that when Jacob went down into Egypt, he took with him a company of a thousand souls, who, being circumcised, would be reckoned as Israelites. Neither does it form any the slightest objection to the narrative that the increase is one of unusual amount. To those who would measure the Israelites by the standard of other nations, and who, in so doing, entirely ignore the promise made to Abraham, the story presents an improbability of the very highest degree; an improbability, however, which instantly vanishes when you take into account the peculiar circumstances of the favoured nation. Mr. Rawlinson takes some pains here, and we think unnecessarily, to show all the circumstances which extenuate the difficulty and diminish the extraordinariness of the case. After all, the case is extraordinary, whether people choose to call it miraculous or not.

Mr. Rawlinson's essay concludes as follows—

'It appears, then, from this whole review, that there is nothing in the history of the world, so far as it is yet known, that forms even a serious objection to the authenticity of the Pentateuch. Were we bound down to the numbers of the Hebrew text in regard to the period between the Flood and Abraham, we should, indeed, find ourselves in a difficulty. Three hundred and seventy years would certainly not seem to be sufficient time for the peopling of the world, to the extent to which it appears to have been peopled in the days of Abraham, and for the formation of powerful and settled monarchies in Babylonia and Egypt. But the adoption of the Septuagint numbers for this period, which are on every ground preferable, brings the chronology into harmony at once with the condition of the world as shown to us in the account given in Scripture of the times of Abraham, and with the results obtainable from the study, in a sober spirit, of profane history. A thousand years is ample time for the occupation of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt, by a considerable population, for the formation of governments, the erection even of such buildings as the Pyramids, the advance of the arts generally to the condition found to exist in Egypt under the eighteenth dynasty, and for almost any amount of subdivision and variety in languages. More time does not seem to be in any sense needed by the facts of history hitherto known to us. The world, generally, is in a primitive and simple condition at the time of the call of Abraham. Men are still chiefly nomades. Population seems sparse; for Abraham and Lot find

plenty of vacant land in Palestine, and the descendants of Abraham experience no difficulty in overspreading several countries. Settled kingdoms appear nowhere, except in Egypt and Babylonia; and there the governments are of the simplest form. Art in Babylonia is in a poor and low condition, the implements used being chiefly of stone and flint. Yet Babylon is much superior to her neighbours, holds Assyria in subjection, and claims the second place in the history of the world. Her historical beginnings reach back, at the utmost, to B.C. 2458, while those of Egypt are probably but a very little earlier. All other nations acknowledge themselves younger than these two, and have no traditions even of their existence much before B.C. 2000. The idea that the Biblical chronology is too narrow, that it cramps history, and needs to be set aside in favour of a scheme which puts 10,000 years between the Deluge and the birth of Christ, is not one which has grown upon men gradually through the general tenor of their inquiries into the antiquities of different nations. It is merely the dream of a single historical enthusiast, who, devoting himself to the history of one country, and pinning his faith on one author—whom after all he exaggerates and misrepresents—has come to imagine that the additional time is required by the history of his favourite, and has then forced and strained the histories of other countries, with which he has no special acquaintance, into a distant agreement with the chronological scheme formed upon the supposed necessities of a single kingdom and people. As for the further requirement of another 10,000 years between the Deluge and the creation of man, it rests upon linguistic phantasies of the most purely speculative character. The remainder of the historical objections to the authenticity of the Pentateuch, though sometimes ingenious, have in them nothing to alarm us. Profane history is decidedly favourable to a Deluge extending to all races of men, and to the greater longevity of man in the earlier ages. Ethnological research tends continually more and more to confirm, instead of shaking, the account given of the affiliation of nations in the tenth chapter of Genesis. The more accurately old myths are examined, the more evident does it become that their tone and spirit are wholly different from the tone and spirit of Scripture. The Pentateuch has the air and manner of history; the Jews have always regarded it in that light; and modern historical and geographical inquiries, whenever they afford an opportunity of testing the accuracy of the narrative, are found to bear witness to its truth. Whatever may be the scientific difficulties in the way of a literal reception of some portions, historical difficulties of any real magnitude there are none. Internally, the narrative is consistent with itself; externally, it is supported by all that has any claim to be considered sober earnest in the histories of other nations. The Christian world, which has reposed upon it for nearly 2,000 years, as an authentic record of the earliest ages, is justified, by all the results of modern historical research, in still continuing its confident trust. There is really not a pretence for saying that recent discoveries in the field of history, monumental or other, have made the acceptance of the Mosaic narrative in its plain and literal sense any more difficult now than in the days of Bossuet or Stillingfleet.—*Ibid.* pp. 282—284.

We have not much space left to notice the remaining essays in this volume. We have already implied that as answers to the volume of 'Essays and Reviews' they are not very efficient. As containing the thoughts of able men as regards subjects much discussed at the present day, they are not without their value. We should be doing an injustice, however, to the author of the concluding essay of the volume, if we passed it over with this remark. If the other essays in the

volume may be spoken of as cold and dry, stiff, harsh and repulsive, and some of them more argumentative than conclusive on the points at issue, the essay on Scripture and its Interpretation is unquestionably entitled to the praise of reality and warmth of devotion. It is at once interesting and instructive, though it is distinctly polemical. It might be difficult to say, with regard to some of these papers, which of the obnoxious Essays they were specially levelled against. This is distinctly an answer to the last of the seven papers in the series of 'Essays and Reviews.' In some respects the combatants have some points of resemblance. Each strikes the reader as the most real and earnest writer of his party; each has an attractiveness amounting almost to fascination; and each strikes us as wanting that comprehensiveness of mind which can grasp the bearings of a whole subject. Mr. Jowett certainly penned a most telling sentence when he observed, that the differences in the interpretation of Scripture, as distinguished from all other books, are so great, that it requires an effort of thought to appreciate the fact. These variations Mr. Ellicott asserts to be neither so numerous or so important as is taken for granted. He justly remarks that these two statements amount only to assertion and counter-assertion, and makes the pertinent observation, that the proof of this would occupy more space than is assigned him; more than most readers would follow him through; and, in the end, would fail to be convincing on the ground that, whatever exhibition might be made of the amount of agreement among commentators, it would be thought a similar array of discordant and contradictory interpretations might be drawn up. We think the Dean of Exeter makes out a fair case as against Mr. Jowett, of having been guilty of exaggerating the amount of variation in interpretation of Scripture. At the same time, a better answer is required for such a charge than to show that it is exaggerated. With regard to his illustration of the subject, by taking De Wette and Meyer as two specimens of modern German commentators, and S. Chrysostom and Theodoret as instances of ancient writers, who, upon the whole, agree with them, we are at a loss to see what it proves, except that there is a certain amount of agreement as to the interpretation of Scripture among certain commentators. Mr. Ellicott would hardly wish it to be pressed to the extent which it will not bear, that there is any considerable agreement between these two and other writers of the present day. The principle of Protestantism is undoubtedly hard pushed by the variations in the explanation of texts of Scripture. If Scripture is to be the ultimate standard of appeal between individual and individual, we must confess we do not see what it has to stand upon.

After making all the allowances that can be made on the score of exaggeration, we think it cannot be denied that there is a great, and what on Protestant principles appears to us a most wonderful amount of variation in the interpretation of Holy Scripture. We say it is inexplicable on Protestant principles, because on Catholic principles there is no difficulty nor reason for astonishment in the matter. Taking Scripture as intended not to teach a new faith, but to confirm one which had been taught before, according to the expression of S. Luke, 'That thou mightest know the certainty of those things in which thou hast been instructed,' there is no such great amount of variation in its interpretation as given by those who were commissioned to teach it. And so, if seceders from the Church have wrested its meaning so as to represent it as favouring their peculiar tenets, that is only a phenomenon that might naturally be expected. The only subject for wonder then becomes, the countenance which, *prima facie*, certain texts in the Bible seem to lend to such doctrines. But even here the surprise will be considerably lessened when we think of the immense range, both of subject and of writing, comprised in this volume, and the isolated way in which a few texts are often detached from their context, and made to do duty, perhaps, in defence of a doctrine which they were intended to impugn, or in support of a theory to which they do not even indirectly allude. We are surprised that this view has not been put forward more prominently. We are persuaded that there is no other answer to be found to the objection against dogmatism on the score of the variation of interpretation of Scripture. Nor, again, have we ever seen any fair reply to another doubt of Mr. Jowett's, put out in the same essay, when he says, it is difficult to understand what is meant by 'proving from Scripture.'

In subordination to this view of the subject, which appears to us somewhat overlooked by the Dean of Exeter, we find much that we can agree with in following him through the second portion of his essay, in which, after admitting the great diversity of interpretation in individual passages and in details, he proceeds to assign this diversity to three different causes. The variations are said to result (1) from the fact that the Bible is different from all other books in the world, and its interpretation may therefore well be supposed to involve many difficulties and diversities; (2) from the words of Scripture having more than one meaning and application; (3) from the fact of the inspiration of Scripture. The last consideration really involves the other two, though there are manifest reasons why the three may be advantageously discussed separately. As a specimen under the second head we quote the following:—

'St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. iv. 8), not only makes a citation from a Psalm, which at the part in question appears to have a simple historical reference to some event of the time (perhaps the taking of Rabbah), but even alters the words of the original, so as to make its application to our Lord more pertinent and telling. What are we to say of such a case? Does it not really look like an instance of almost unwarrantable accommodation? Does it not seem as if we had now fairly fallen upon the point of our own sword, and that, in citing an example of a second meaning, we had unwittingly selected one in which the very alteration shows that the words did not originally have the meaning now attributed to them? Before we thus yield, let us at any rate state the case, and leave the fair reader to form his own opinion. Without at present assuming the existence of any influence which would have directly prevented the Apostle from so seriously misunderstanding and so gravely misapplying a passage of the Old Testament, and only assuming it as proved that there is one authentic instance of words of Scripture bearing a further meaning than meets the eye, we now ask which is to be judged as most likely: that the Apostle to substantiate a statement, which could have been easily substantiated by other passages, deliberately altered a portion of Scripture which had no reference to the matter before him, or that he rightly assigned to a seemingly historical passage from a Psalm, which (be it observed), in its original scope, has every appearance of being prophetic and Messianic, a deeper meaning than the words seem to bear (such a meaning being in one case, at least, admitted to exist), and that he altered the form of the words to make more palpable and evident the meaning which he knew they involved? We have no anxiety as to the decision in the case of any calm-judging and unbiassed reader. . . . One further remark we may make in conclusion, and it is a remark of some little importance, viz. that if the present instance be deemed an example of Scripture having a second and deeper, as well as a first and more simple meaning, it must also be regarded as an example of an authoritative change in the exact words of a quotation,—the change being designed to bring up the underlying meaning which was known to exist, and to place it with more distinctness before the mind of the general reader.'—*Ibid.* pp. 402, 403.

With regard to the inspiration of Holy Scripture, Mr. Ellicott attacks the statement of Mr. Jowett that the term inspiration is but of yesterday, and that the question of inspiration was not determined by the Fathers, by bringing a number of references to Fathers of all ages to show that they implicitly believed in the inspiration of Scripture. But here it appears to us the author has fallen into the same mistake with Dr. Wordsworth, in his criticism of the same passage. Mr. Jowett does not attempt to deny that the Fathers believed in the inspiration of Scripture, a fact which is patent to the observation of any one who has ever opened a volume of their writings. What he meant to do was to disparage the idea of inspiration, which he does not admit himself, by asserting that neither the ancients nor moderns knew its limits or were able to define it. We are far from saying that the allegation that the limits of inspiration are obscure requires an answer, or that it would be possible to give a satisfactory theory of inspiration, free from all liability to objection; and, acquiescing entirely in the view which is propounded in this essay, we regret the more that words should

have been wasted in defence of a statement that has never been impugned, viz. that the Fathers treated Holy Scripture as inspired. For ourselves, we frankly admit that there is no more possibility of distinguishing the exact limits of inspiration than there is of deciding between the ordinary and the miraculous. We are sorry even to appear to find fault with an essay which in almost every respect wins our sympathy and commands our respect. No essay of the series will bear any comparison with it in point of feeling. It is impossible to read any part of it without feeling sure that the author has thrown himself heart and soul into his subject—that he believes most firmly every word that he writes. It is perhaps the most interesting essay, and beyond all doubt gives us the very experiences of the writer's own life. In this respect it will be extremely useful. It will be felt that Mr. Ellicott has a right to speak as he does, not only because he has devoted much of his life to the interpretation of Scripture, but especially because he seems to express the very thoughts of his own heart, in attributing the following convictions to devout students of Holy Writ:—

‘A third remark may be made on the negative side by way of complaint that we find so little weight assigned to the subjective argument, as it may be termed, for the inspiration of Scripture. In the sceptical writings of the day the argument is rarely stated except to be dealt with as a form of a natural but not very harmless illusion. Yet it is an argument of the greatest force and importance, and an argument which, if rightly handled, it is much easier to set aside than to answer. Is it nothing that the Bible has spoken to millions upon millions of hearts, as it were with the very voice of God Himself? Have not its words burned within till men have seen palpably the Divine in that which spake to them? Is it not a fact that convictions on the nature of the Scriptures deepen with deepening study of them? Ask the simple man to whom the Bible has long become the daily friend and counsellor, who reads and applies what he reads as far as his natural powers enable him; ask him whether longer and more continued study has altered to any extent his estimate of the Book as a Divine revelation. What is the invariable answer? The Book “has found him;” it has consoled him in sorrows for which there seemed no consolation on this side the grave; it has wiped away tears that it seemed could only be wiped away in that far land where sadness shall be no more; it has pleaded gently during long seasons of spiritual coldness; it has infused strength in hours of weakness; it has calmed in moments of excitement; it has given to better emotions a permanence, and to stirred-up feelings a reality; it has made itself felt to be what it is; out of the abundance of his heart the mouth speaks, and he tells us with all the accumulated convictions of an honest mind, that if he once deemed the Bible to be fully inspired on the testimony of others, now he knows it on evidence that has been brought home to his own soul. He has now long had the witness in himself, and that witness he feels and knows is unchangeably and enduringly true.

‘Ask, again, the professed student of Scripture, the scholar, the divine, the interpreter, one who, to what we may term the testimony of the soul, in the case of the less cultivated reader, can add the testimony of the mind and the spirit—ask such a one whether increased familiarity with Scripture has quickened or obscured his perception of the Divine within it, whether it has led him to higher or to lower views of inspiration. Have not, we may perhaps anxiously

ask, the difficulties of Scripture wearied him; its seeming discordances perplexed, its obscurities depressed him? Have not the tenor of its arguments, and the seeming want of coherence and connexion in adjacent sentences, sometimes awakened uneasy and disquieting thoughts? What is most invariably the answer?—"No; far otherwise." Deepened study has brought its blessing and its balm. It has shown how what might seem the greatest difficulties often turn merely upon our ignorance of one or two unrecorded facts or relations; it has conducted to standing-points where in a moment all that has hitherto seemed confused and distorted has arranged itself in truest symmetry and in the fairest perspective. In many an obscure passage our student will tell us how the light has oft-times suddenly broken, how he has been cheered by being permitted to recognise and identify the commingling of human weakness and Divine power, the mighty revelation almost too great for mortal utterance, the "earthen vessel" almost parting asunder from the greatness and abundance of the heavenly treasure committed to it. He will tell us, again, how in many a portion where the logical connexion has seemed suspended or doubtful—in one of those discourses, for instance, of his Lord as recorded by St. John—the true connexion has at length slowly and mysteriously disclosed itself, how he has perceived and realized all. For a while he has felt himself thinking as his Saviour vouchsafed to think, in part of beholding truth as those Divine eyes beheld it; for a brief space his mind has seemed to be consciously one with the mind of Christ. All this he has perceived and felt. And he will tell us, perchance, what has often been the sequel; how he has risen from his desk and fallen on his knees, and with uplifted voice blessed and adored Almighty God for His gift of the Book of Life.

'The cold-hearted may smile at such things, the so-called philosophical may affect to account for them; they may be put aside as illusions, or they may be explained away as projections of self on the passive page, unconscious infusion of one's own feelings and emotions in the calm words that meet the outward eye. All this has been urged against such testimony, and will ever be urged even to the very end. But when the end does come the truth will appear. That witnessing of soul and spirit will, it may be, rise up in silent judgment against many a one who elights it; that testimony so often rejected as self-engendered and fanciful, will be seen to have been real and heaven-born, a reflex image of eternal truth, a part and a portion of the surest of the sure things of God.'—*Ibid.* pp. 409—411.

We must refer our readers to the essay itself for an account of the author's theory of inspiration. We have neither space to give extracts enough to make it intelligible to the ordinary reader, nor to give an analysis of it such as would induce him to have recourse to the essay itself. We confess to a feeling that with all the moderation of tone which characterizes both this and other parts of the essay, the author much underrates the grave difficulties that surround every theory that can be given; though we fully admit that the difficulties are of a logical and argumentative kind, which may perhaps cause no uneasiness to a devout mind.

The last half of the essay is devoted to the proper method of interpretation. After a few remarks on the necessity of a preliminary preparation for the study of Holy Scripture by prayer, and recommending candour in statement of what seems probable, even though it appears to militate against all our preconceived

opinions, he proceeds to lay down four canons of interpretation:—

1. *Ascertain as clearly as it may be possible the literal and grammatical meaning of the words.* 2. *Illustrate wherever possible by reference to history, topography, and antiquities.* 3. *Develop and enunciate the meaning under the limitations assigned by the context, or, in other words, interpret contextually.* 4. *In every passage elicit the full significance of all details.*

Again we are forced to do a kind of unavoidable injustice to the author of this interesting paper by omitting the instances in which he exhibits the value of these four rules of criticism, and the manner in which they have been neglected. They seem so very commonplace that, perhaps, to some they will appear mere truisms, but no student will be tempted to despise them who knows anything of the errors both of fact and of doctrine which have sprung from inattention to them. The objections to them that they are so plain and evident, that they are in point of fact pretty much the method which would be adopted by any one in attempting to understand any difficult writer, seem to fall in with Mr. Jowett's advice, 'Interpret Scripture like any other book.' Accordingly, the author observes that, after he has condensed his canons into one, viz. interpret grammatically, historically, contextually, and minutely, the real point of interest yet remains to be discussed. If Scripture is unlike all other books, it might be expected that the rules applicable to the explanation of other books should be inadequate to the full interpretation of all parts of Scripture. Mr. Ellicott does not scruple to speak of his four canons as insufficient and incomplete, and that specially with reference to three large classes of passages:—1. Passages of *general* difficulty. 2. Passages of *doctrinal* difficulty. 3. Passages of *theological* difficulty. With regard to the first he furnishes us with the following canon—*Let the writer interpret himself.* This, though in words the same rule which might be advantageously applied to any writer, and is in fact the *Non nisi ex Aristotele ipso*, &c. commonly quoted as the rule for understanding the Greek philosophers, in its present relation has a deeper meaning. The rule, as applied to an ordinary writer of philosophy, would arise from the conviction that he would be consistent with himself; a rule which may even be stretched too far, and, perhaps, has in some cases caused, instead of removed, difficulties; but its peculiar significance in the present instance is derived from the 'express recognition of a general and pervading inspiration—an influence which, contrary to what might have been looked for in the case of a writer on subjects above man's natural power, kept the writer always in harmony with himself, and his words always self-explanatory and consistent.' The necessity of this addition to

the previously laid-down canons is shown by reference to passages which will not yield to ordinary rules of criticism, but which are satisfactorily explained on this principle. The transition of this canon to the next is obvious, though it involves an assumption which Essayists and Reviewers would, perhaps, scarcely like to admit. That unity and consistency which might naturally be expected in the different parts of the works of a single writer is claimed for the whole volume which we call the Bible. This is not much to ask of any one who believes in it as containing a revelation from God to man, but is probably more than will be conceded by many readers of the volume of 'Essays and Reviews,' or, perhaps, by some who may condescend to give a glance at the volume we are reviewing. Granting the hypothesis, however, the rule becomes one which it is impossible to object to—*Where possible let Scripture interpret itself*, or, in other words, *interpret according to the analogy of Scripture*. If the rule is to be considered absolute, it, of course, implies a belief in the inspiration of all parts of Scripture. That even this canon is not perfect, and requiring no supplementary rule, is evidenced by reference to the text, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, and our readers will, perhaps, anticipate the last canon as that with which they are in the habit of tacitly referring to in all their reading and study. *Interpret according to the analogy of Faith*. The author has thus most skilfully conducted his readers, by exhibiting the sheer necessity of the case, to that fundamental rule, without the recognition of which Scripture would be to the mass of readers either a dead letter or an apparent defence of heresy. Mr. Ellicott has reached, by what he himself call an inductive process, the very principle which the Church supplies us with in prejudicing the minds of her children, by thoroughly imbuing them with the doctrines of the Creed and the Catechism, before they are able to read the Bible for themselves. Of course every one will at once recognise that this is the real battle-field. Mr. Jowett has only enunciated the very watchword of Protestantism, but which Protestantism has been slow to adopt or to give publicity to, when he spoke of the Nicene definition as the greatest misfortune that had befallen Christendom. The objection shall be answered in Mr. Ellicott's own words:—

'Against such a rule, we are well aware, many an argument will be urged, many an exception will be taken. We have been told, and we shall often be told again, that to interpret by the Nicene or the Athanasian Creed is not only to mar the simplicity of Scripture, by bringing it in contact with what is artificial and technical, but consciously to involve ourselves in a plain and patent anachronism.

'To such mere assertions, for mere assertions they really are, it is not necessary, after what has been said, to return any formal answer. It may be

enough to make the two following remarks, and with them this portion of the subject shall be concluded:—*First*, the charge of anachronism may be readily disposed of by observing that, in thus interpreting Scripture, we are really interpreting it by what, in a certain sense, is anterior to it, viz. the principles of that faith of which Scripture is itself the exponent. *Ante mare fluctus*. What right have we to assume that all the early Christian preaching was only the outpouring of "attachment to a recently departed friend and Lord"? With what justice can we say that the whole of Christianity was contained in the words, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou mayest be saved," when, even in the very earliest of an Apostle's letters, there seems satisfactory evidence (comp. 1 Thess. v. 1, 2 Thess. ii. 5) that deeper things were communicated orally to the earliest Christian converts than were afterwards committed to writing? Most justly, then, has it been observed that, when we thus appeal to the principles of the faith for our guidance in expounding Scriptural difficulty, we are interpreting, not by "the result of three or four centuries of controversy," but by appeals to fixed principles of Christian doctrine, the greater part of which were known, believed, and acted on in the very earliest age of the Gospel. In succeeding centuries these fundamental truths may have been couched in terms of greater scientific exactness; the various controversies of the times may have caused the Church to put forth her doctrines in forms more technically accurate or more logically precise, but the substance was the same from the very first, and it is on that substance that our interpretation of Scripture is really based, it is to that essential truth of which the Church is a pillar, that we make our natural and reasonable appeal.

'The *second* remark is this, that those who are much opposed to us in their estimate of the character and inspiration of Scripture, really in effect admit the principle we are contending for. To say nothing of the occurrence on their pages of such terms as "the analogy of Scripture," when the subject is the best mode of interpreting it, or of the silent but important admission that the principle which "enables us to apply the words of Christ and His Apostles" is neither more nor less than "the analogy of faith,"—to pass over all these tacit and almost instinctive recognitions of the one great truth (1 Tim. iii. 15), from which all that has been said above comes by way of legitimate deduction, let us merely take the rule which others have laid down, and fairly consider whether the recommendation to "interpret Scripture from itself" is not in effect and substance plainly identical with much that has been already advocated in these pages. Such a rule, in the first place, involves the very important assumption which we have above alluded to, viz. that Scripture is consistent with itself, even when such consistency might be appealed to as a very evidence of its Divine origin; and in the second place, after every possible limitation—viz. that we are to understand it to mean interpreting "like by like,"—such a rule is still, and must remain, based on the recognition of the sound and proper principle that Scripture difficulty must be explained consistently with Scripture truth. Of this truth the Creeds, especially the two shorter, are not only compendious but authoritative abstracts, summarily vouched for by the keeper of our archives and the upholder of their integrity, the Catholic Church of Christ. The same authority might justify us in similarly applying much of her own history and traditions as illustrative of Holy Scripture, if even not deserving the title of an aid in its interpretation. It may be sufficient, however, to claim the Creeds as authoritative summaries of Scripture, and so authoritative guides in interpreting Scripture, being in fact themselves the epitome of that from which it has been properly conceded that Scripture ought to be illustrated and expounded.'—*Ibid.* pp. 445—447.

We should have been glad to offer a few remarks on the two remaining portions of this interesting and instructive paper,

and that the more because we do not exactly agree with the author's view as expressed in either portion. The penultimate section contains cautions, first, as to the application of type and prophecy; the author seems to write in sight, and almost in fear of objections which may be raised, or of ridicule which may be provoked by the allowance of any extended theory of typology and prophetic interpretation; and the instances which he gives show that he would be content to restrict himself within safe limits; yet, whilst we feel inclined to allow a wider latitude, we must acknowledge that we have been frequently provoked in such works as S. Augustine on the Psalms, &c. into denouncing such typical interpretations as puerile. In the last section we are inclined to think the author presses too closely the necessity of grammatical rules as regards the understanding of the Hellenic dialect of the New Testament. Those who are not familiar with the language in its Attic representation would only be puzzled by finding themselves confronted with rules where they would see no difficulties, whilst to the good Greek scholar they are superfluous. Those who have read Greek philosophy as it is read at Oxford, and have been accustomed to the study both of the New Testament, and of the specimens of Attic Greek that are commonly used at schools and colleges, can afford to dispense with 'ethical uses,' and the like.

Lastly, it seems right to say, that we have criticised without any scruple an essay which is in many respects above and beyond criticism. If Mr. Ellicott's essay must yield the palm on the score of intellectual power to the first essay in the volume, yet it is beyond all doubt the one which has interested us most. It was not meant to convert any of the writers of the obnoxious volume, neither is it the kind of essay that would have any chance of doing so; but we confidently anticipate that more good will result from its publication than from anything that has appeared on the subject of 'Essays and Reviews.' We must give the conclusion of it in the author's own words.

'Those against whom our observations have been directed will probably not be affected by anything that we have urged. The tone of self-confidence which marks their writings; the unfairness or, to use the mildest term, the slipperiness that pervades their arguments; the really cruel and thoughtless way in which they have allowed themselves to scatter doubt and uneasiness; their utter carelessness for the feeble, and the unstable, and the many who, with all their frailties and shortcomings, still deserve the name of "babes in Christ"—all these many painful characteristics make us feel that as far as they are concerned we have written and have spoken in vain. There are others, however, with whom it may not be so. There are kindly eyes that may have fallen on these pages, which, though not seeing wholly as we see, may yet have been encouraged to gaze longer and more earnestly, and to wait gently and patiently

for a glimpse of the fair landscape that lies beyond what now may seem to them only a cloud-land of eddying vapour and wandering storm. God in His everlasting mercy, for our dear Lord's sake, grant that it may be so! God grant that such may see and feel that these are no cunningly devised fables, no mere arguments put forward for love of controversy, no mere assumption of orthodox attitudes for the sake of self-interest (untrue and ignoble taunt of embittered opponents!), but a statement of earnest and serious convictions, which deepen with deepening reflection, to which every fleeting day bears its tribute of increasing assurance, which every prayer quickens, every blessing stimulates, every trial confirms. May they be moved to judge us thus kindly and fairly; and may our poor words be permitted in return to impart some comfort in anxieties, and to answer some of those doubts with which honest and good hearts are often permitted to be tried.

'Lastly, may the great Father of love and mercy draw all who love His ever blessed Son, and who see in Him the propitiation for the sins of a whole guilty world, still nearer together. It may be, when all was well, we dealt hardly with each other, that we thought unkindly and spoke with bitterness. It may be even that we have acted in the same spirit, that we have helped to break up the household of faith into hostile camps, that we have smitten friends and brethren, and led those who would not use our shibboleths to the vale of slaughter and spared them not. But now the foe is on the frontier. If love is still cold, yet at least let danger reunite. Let us yield to instincts, if we care not yet for principles. Let us do only this, and it may be that even thus we may be allowed to see and feel that all was so ordered by a loving Father—that danger was to bring about reunion, and reunion to rekindle love. And then at last, with linked hands and united hearts, may we again join in praising and blessing our common Lord, evermore adoring Him who round our weakness and divisions winds the encircling bond of his strength and love, "round our incompleteness His completeness, round our restlessness His rest..."—*Ibid.* pp. 468, 469.

ART. V.—1. *The Works of George Herbert.* In Two Volumes. Pickering. 1850.

2. *The Works of George Herbert.* In One Volume. Edited by the REV. R. A. WILLMOTT. Routledge. 1859.

AMONG the distinctive features of the present condition of English literature, not the least remarkable is the system now widely established of circulating libraries on a very large scale. These institutions—for, without exaggeration, they deserve the name—are of great service in keeping the dullest village and the most sequestered country-house or parsonage in easy communication with the metropolis, the great centre of intellectual life. They are useful, too, for authors, and especially for those who have yet to acquire a name, as providing a machinery for introducing their works to public notice. They are useful for readers, as affording them an opportunity of pregustration—of glancing cursorily at what may be worth reading once, but once only; and of forming a more permanent acquaintance with those few rare works of genius or learning which, once seen, all who have the power, desire to add to their own libraries. Without doubt, in all this there are advantages which our grandfathers did not enjoy. On the other hand, these extensive libraries, with their fortnightly lists of the ‘new books’ which are continually struggling into the light of day, and rudely displacing their predecessors, are one among the chief causes of our neglect of such books as have not the recommendation of novelty. Even the great works of our living authors have only a brief popularity. The laureate’s latest poem, or the last, for the time being, of the brilliant and inexhaustible series of ‘My Novels,’ after being announced with all due ceremony, welcomed, discussed, devoured, is soon—not forgotten, that would be impossible—but laid aside among the things that have been, while the new favourite of the hour reigns in its stead. Still more is this to be regretted in the case of what is really literature of the past. Scott, for example, has never been surpassed, if equalled, as a novelist, yet any third-rate novel or ‘novelette’ of the day, vapid, incoherent, inane, is often taken up in preference, merely because *it is new*. It is not that there is anything in Scott to render him really obsolete. There is a charm in his exquisite graces of imagination and language that no lapse of time can ever wear off, even though, to our taste, his dialogues may seem stilted, and the pace of his narrative slow.

Of course, in history and travels, except for readers who have occasion to refer to original authorities, and, most of all, amid the vast and daily increasing acquirements of physical science, this superannuation of old writers is inevitable. Not so in works of fiction; not so in poetry, endued, as all true poetry is, with a perpetual youth. Yet even Shakespeare with us, though duly honoured, is, after all, seldom read, slightly known. But we need not pursue the subject further. It does not admit of question. We live too much in the present. Our ears are too preoccupied by the loud and impatient voices of the restless scene around us to listen to the calm, clear accents which speak from the far distance. We are in danger, it must be owned, of neglecting the treasures of the past, while, with contracted range of vision and hasty grasp, we care only to seize what lies close within reach as we drift along.

The particular author whose undeserved neglect suggests these remarks, is one whose name at least is well known, if his writings are not. In last year's exhibition of paintings, not a few among the gazers who crowded the Royal Academy's rooms were attracted round a small but highly finished picture, which, to say nothing of its other claims to be noticed (and these are considerable with all who can appreciate the delicacy, repose, and careful execution of Mr. Dyce's manner), certainly stood out in unique contrast to its companions both in subject and colouring. It transported the spectator from the many-coloured silks and whispered criticisms of the gay concourse of sightseers to a trim lawn, under the green foliage of spreading limes, beside a smoothly-flowing river. Here we see a solitary figure lost in thought, with half-spread book in hand, pacing slowly with steps timed to the peaceful flow of the stream. His refined, thoughtful cast of features, and grave clerical costume of James the First's time, together with the fishing-tackle on the bank, guitar resting against the trunk of a tree, and the shapely spire of his dear Salisbury Cathedral rising in the distance, plainly identify him as George Herbert. Although far too sensible a man to attempt to give such a distracted attention to different things at once, as this collocation of rod, book, and music seems to imply, still these accessories are not out of place, as giving some idea of the extent and variety of Herbert's tastes and pursuits. But the general impression produced by the picture is inadequate. It is rather that of a recluse, a visionary sentimental bookworm, than of a man who combined with the devotion and self-discipline of a Thomas à Kempis, the accomplishments of a perfect gentleman, the genial humour and shrewd, practical sense of a thorough man of the world. Mr. Dyce's picture, while representing well the serenity which

Herbert's impetuous nature gained by rigid exercise of self-control and resignation, illustrates only too well the popular misconception, universal among those who know George Herbert only by report. Most persons, we may venture to say, only think of him as, to borrow Mr. Spurgeon's elegant designation of him, 'a devout old Puseyite' of the time of the first Stuart, completely estranged from their sympathy, not by the antiquated manners of the period only, but by his own singular austerity of life, and extraordinary self-abnegation. Most persons merely know his poetry by a few lines culled here and there to provoke a smile at their quaintness and want of rhythm. Even among those who cherish with loving reverence the memory of his holy and beautiful life, few are aware—for it needs patient research, undiscouraged by the archaisms of a style strangely dissonant to our modern ears—how high a place he is entitled to, purely on the ground of intellectual ability. Among the rich legacies of literature bequeathed to us from the past, and fast being lost under the accumulating dust of ages, Herbert's 'Remains' especially deserve to be rescued from neglect, and restored to a place on our bookshelves and in our hearts. They are valuable, not merely or chiefly to the archæologist, but intrinsically; and, in particular, at the present time, as containing the antidote to many of the evils incidental to the tendencies of our modern literature. But we must proceed to adduce our reasons for claiming so high a niche in their gallery of worthies for one, of whom probably our readers have hitherto formed a far lower estimate.

In his own century Herbert's writings were popular enough. It is characteristic of his modesty, or, more strictly speaking, of the victory which he won over his naturally eager and ambitious temperament, that they were all posthumous in publication. The Poems seem to have been written before the 'Country Parson.' His preface to the latter is dated 1632, the year of his death; and its other name, by which it was more usually known at first, 'A Priest to the Temple,' seems to indicate that it was conceived in its author's mind as a companion volume to the already existing, though unpublished collection of poems, entitled 'The Temple.' These poems were evidently not the work of any particular period in his life, but the growth of years; kept under lock and key, according to the wise advice of Horace, until arrived at nonage. 'The Temple' was first given to the world in 1633, by Nicholas Ferrar, Herbert's literary executor; under his editorship it was printed by his daughters and other members of his household, or 'Protestant Nunnery' as it has been called, at Little Gidding, in Northamptonshire, and then published at Cambridge, after being, of course,

formally licensed by the Vice-Chancellor's 'imprimatur.'¹ In about forty years, so good Izaak Walton says in 1674, it passed through ten editions, more than 20,000 copies being sold; a success quite out of proportion to that of the far greater poet, of whose 'Paradise Lost,' shortly afterwards, only 1,300 copies were sold in the first two years, and only 3,000 in the first eleven years after its appearance. But the unpopularity of Milton's politics and theology easily explains this disparity, to say nothing of the inevitable repugnance, which even in those laborious days a profoundly learned and recondite epic, in twelve books, would have to encounter in the majority of readers. The 'Country Parson'—it is not plain for what cause—was not published till 1652. It would naturally attract scarcely any but professional readers, yet it went through three editions in twenty years. We cannot trace the progress of either volume through succeeding editions. The men of the eighteenth century were not likely to admire George Herbert. His style was too abrupt and unadorned for their elaborately rounded periods, his religious aspirations too glowing for their decorous conventionalities, his theology too patristic for their latitudinarianism, and, we may add, his thoughts at once too profound and too rudely chiselled for their polished but superficial philosophy. Till Pickering's costly and beautiful edition in 1840—one among many other instances of the good taste and too enterprising spirit of that publisher—there was no complete edition of George Herbert's works. But, as we begun by saying, they were honoured among their contemporaries. *Valeat quantum.* Let us try to estimate the worth of that popularity.

The Elizabethan era, towards the close of which George Herbert was born, has been called by some, who prefer its sturdy masculine vigour to the superior refinement of Pope and Addison, the Augustan age in English literature. It resembles rather the last days of the Republic, when the massive intellect of Rome was beginning to appropriate to itself the treasures of Grecian civilization. With equal avidity, and with equal inexperience and awkwardness at first, the great minds of Elizabeth's age, and of that which immediately succeeded it, seized the new stores of intellectual wealth laid open to them by the revival of classical learning, and by frequent intercourse with Italy, then, even more emphatically than ever, the land of art and song. That era may be compared to that delicious season of the year, the 'jocund month of May,' of which the poets of the time were never weary of singing the praises, combining at once the

¹ Many private papers of George Herbert were lost in the fire at Highnam House, Gloucestershire, the seat of Sir Robert Cook, the second husband of George Herbert's widow.

freshness and transparency of spring with something of the riper loveliness, without the languor of summer. The ruggedness, too, of the literature of those times finds its parallel in the sharp winds of May, of which we, the less hardy descendants of the men who repelled the Armada, are, with the exception of Mr. Kingsley, as his Ode to the East Wind shows, so apt peevishly to complain. It was an age of mother wit, as yet comparatively rude and unpolished, and of learning pursued as yet with too indiscriminating a voracity. The healthy appetite of the giants of those days, uncloyed by modern profusion, delighted in whatever it found, and was discouraged by no difficulties. We see in George Herbert at times, and more often in Milton and other contemporaries, something which looks at first sight like a pedantic ostentation of learning, but is really the mere exuberance of delight at discovering a vein of hidden ore. The great minds of that day were, after all, the masters, not the slaves, of their learning. Their originality was not stifled nor dwarfed beneath its weight. The very difficulties of the work gave an additional zest to it, and stimulated their faculties to the utmost. The severity of this discipline, for there was no 'royal road' to learning then, and few of those appliances which facilitate our journey, rendered whatever knowledge was acquired more real and solid, more thoroughly assimilated to the mind of the learner. To be a 'painful scholar' was great praise, and synonymous with being a good one. Books were then scarce and dear, and prized accordingly. When George Herbert wished to buy a new book at College, he was obliged, in spite of his liberal allowance, to 'fast for it,' as he writes to his father-in-law, Sir John Danvers, in order to indulge himself in so great a luxury. In these days of cheap paper and steam presses, we can hardly conceive the reverence then felt for anything in the shape of a printed book, almost as if a sacred thing. Nor is it easy for us, living in the whirl of incessant communication by the rail, the post-office and the telegraph, to throw ourselves back even for a moment into the deliberate movements, not in travelling only, but in speaking, writing, thinking, of the men of those days. As we trace their faded manuscripts, we see in their strong, square penmanship, with every single letter firmly and perfectly defined, the nervous and muscular grasp of the writers. It is the transcript of their character, of their energy, exactitude, perseverance. The succinct and condensed sentences, formal and stiff certainly, yet terser and racier than our comparatively loose and inarticulate style, express the perspicuity and reality, as well as the narrowness and slowness, of their conceptions. Hallam calls that age 'the most learned, in the sense in which the word was then taken,

that Europe has ever seen.' The limitation is important, as reminding us that inductive philosophy was yet in its infancy. The learned were more conversant with the unchanging laws of mind, inherited through the schoolmen from the Porch and the Academy, than with the fluctuating sciences of the material world. In its own way the learning of the Elizabethan and post-Elizabethan ages was prodigious.

But the peculiar characteristics of that age, which essentially distinguish it from our own, were, as we have already hinted, deliberation, earnestness, concentration of purpose. Men had a more leisurely, and yet a more painstaking way of thinking and acting, and a sense of enjoyment and repose in their work, not easily attainable in these days of high pressure. They could realise better than we the beautiful thought with which Milton consoled himself in the forced inactivity of his blindness—

‘They also serve, who only stand and wait.’

They could find hours, while we can scarcely spare moments, for undisturbed meditation; a habit of mind as much at variance with our mobile temperament, as the stillness of the old inns of court is unlike the din and turmoil of Fleet Street, which roars outside their gates. The feverish spirit of speculation, which in commerce makes or destroys a fortune in a day, and exercises the same perturbing influence even over our philosophy and literature, was altogether alien to the orderly and scrupulous habits of that age. The advantages of our own day are great, in the triumphal march of physical science, in the vastness of our intellectual horizon, in the richer complexity of our acquirements, and, above all, because the critical faculty is quickened and refined by long experience. But in this very diffusiveness of aims there is a great danger. We seem to want that closeness of concentration which stamps the Elizabethan age.

One among the best of our living poets, Mr. Matthew Arnold, in the preface to his volume of poems, complains of the want of ‘sanity’ in modern literature. There is an unnatural straining after originality, and an impatience of authority or control, which too often disfigure even our greatest works. The clever and popular ‘George Eliot,’ for example, may be taken as a typical instance in many respects, though not, we may hope, in all, of modern tendencies. The wonderfully graphic delineations of life and character are spoilt by bad taste, an unevenly balanced judgment, and a strange confusion in the ideas of right and wrong. It is a great relief to turn from such unwholesome exhalations of a false and unreal philosophy, to the bright, clear, buoyant atmosphere which Shakespeare and his contemporaries breathed. No wonder that the Elizabethan age attracts so power-

fully the sympathies of writers like Mr. Kingsley. They find there a hearty and robust geniality, a manly common-sense, an emancipation from modern subjectivity of thought, such as they delight in, while they are lenient towards the coarseness of speech into which that boyish exuberance of animal spirits was apt to degenerate. It would be great injustice to set down the age of Elizabeth and James as licentious and immoral, on the score of the occasional *grossièreté* of its drama. True, that the continental fashions then being imported from France and Italy, and by the Englishmen who served in great numbers in the debauched camps of the Low Countries, tended to corrupt the court. If we may judge from Howel's gossiping letters, Lord Dalgarno, in Scott's 'Nigel,' is no unfair sample of its profligacy. But this laxity of morals did not taint the great bulk of the nation—the country gentry living at home on their own estates, the stalwart yeomen of the country, the staid citizens of the towns. At no other period, perhaps, was the 'middle-class' (using that vague term to embrace both professions and trades), so generally sound at the core. Never was our commerce at once so daringly enterprising and so strictly honourable: never was the sanctity and happiness of domestic life so fully realised. Accustomed, as we are, to the pert slang of 'governor' for father, and accustomed, it must be owned, to relegate our religion too exclusively to one day in seven, we of this century may smile as we read of grown-up sons, high in office, making lowly obeisance at meeting father or mother, and may wonder that the constant presence of a chaplain was almost a matter of course in every large household. We are so used to see the common recreations of our working man of a low and debasing kind, that we can hardly realise the fact, that almost every family circle in those days in all classes, from the highest to the lowest, could while away the long bright summer evenings in the open air, or the dull afternoons in winter round the hearth, with glee, and round, and madrigal; each age and sex bearing its own part in the manifold harmony of the strain. There is something lost in all this. The Spartan-like deference for old age, the sense of religion as interwoven with the daily affairs of life, the love of music, with leisure to enjoy its cheering and elevating influences,¹ these are habits which no nation can well afford to lose.

But we must return to George Herbert. We have dwelt at length on the characteristics of his age, not merely to show cause why the verdict of his contemporaries should not be set aside as valueless, but also because the man and the age cannot be sepa-

¹ It was well said in an admirable article on 'Music,' since reprinted from the *Quarterly Review*, that the Elizabethan music is full of 'sound piety, broad fun, perfect freedom of speech, and capital eating and drinking.'

rated. He is, at the same time, a result of his age in some degree, and one of the efficient causes of it; being himself modified by its circumstances, while contributing to make it what it is. For this reason we must pause for a few moments longer, to count the long list of illustrious names which that age unrolls.

It was an age fertile in great men. Spenser was writing his 'Faery Queene' just about the time of George Herbert's birth. Raleigh's brilliant but erratic career reached its unhappy close while Herbert was public orator at Cambridge. While holding that office, and dividing his time as he did between the Court and the University, Herbert must have had frequent opportunities of seeing and hearing on the stage the marvellous creations of Shakespeare's genius, then in all the freshness of their first appearance. More exactly coëval with Herbert were Milton, and a galaxy of stars in the poetic firmament of far lesser magnitude and feebler lustre, of whom only a few scattered rays penetrate to us through the intervening mist of years, Daniel, Quarles, Wither, Drummond, Sandys, Suckling, and others. In theology there were Usher, Chillingworth, Hammond, Andrewes, Sanderson, and Hall, a strong array; in philosophy Hobbes and Selden; in jurisprudence Coke and Hale; in political life the Cecils, and many other truly sagacious statesmen; and, last in our enumeration, but foremost in philosophy, in law, and in affairs of state, the great Lord Bacon. We may add to the list Burton, whose 'Anatomy of Melancholy' is no bad sample of the quaint and miscellaneous erudition then in repute. But the drama was the distinguishing glory of those days. Then flourished, in the words of Southey, 'a race of dramatic writers, which no age and no country has ever equalled.' Ben Jonson, the founder of the English 'comedy of manners,' and, inferior only to him, in Hallam's judgment, Massinger; with Beaumont and Fletcher, Ford, Shirley. Such were Herbert's contemporaries; some of them, as Bacon,¹ Andrewes, Sanderson, his intimate personal friends; as were also Lord Pembroke, his kinsman, one of the chief actors in the important work of colonising Virginia, and governing the rising colony; Donne, Cotton, Ferrar, and Sir Henry Wotton, all men of no common ability, highly cultivated, and of a still more uncommon moral excellence. Certainly it was a rich soil, prolific of a healthy and luxuriant vegetation, the age in which George Herbert found himself.

It is impossible to approach Herbert's writing in an unpreju-

¹ Lord Bacon dedicated some metrical psalms to George Herbert; 'and usually,' says Walton, 'desired his approbation, before he would expose any book of his to be printed.'

diced state of mind, unless we first form a just conception of the writer. When the reader feels that he is addressed by one who has a claim on his attention, he is alive to beauties that might otherwise be unnoticed, less on the look-out for faults, can afford to overlook a few blemishes of style here and there—in a word, brings himself into that conformity of feeling with his author, which all artists exact by right as indispensable. Without this *provisional* sympathy, and even deference, no one can be a fair critic. We must divest ourselves at once of the vulgar notion of George Herbert. Far from being a mere devotee, planted on his solitary column in unnatural isolation, inaccessible to his fellow-men, he was emphatically a man of social sympathies, sustained and directed upwards by the entire devotion of his heart to heaven, as the tendrils of a vine are taught to ascend by the elm round which it clings. He loved to watch the 'quidquid agunt' of men, their business and pleasures, not with the contemptuous indifference of a Stoic or Epicurean, but as being all, if duly regulated, component parts in the order and beauty of the universe. Gifted himself with rare natural advantages, he neither neglected nor misused them. Excepting good health (for he was constitutionally delicate, and, in particular, subject to painful and weakening attacks of the ague, then far more prevalent and serious than in our days of good draining), hardly one of fortune's gifts was wanting. He was born of a family noble in the truest sense of the word; for the name of Herbert was eminent then, as now, for the high character of those who bore it, with the difference that modern civilisation has elicited a more peaceful application of the same high spirit which distinguished the 'fighting-men and men of renown,' of whom Lord Herbert of Cherbury, with his usual complacency, reckons not a few among his ancestors. Well born and well bred, with a very prepossessing exterior,¹ with accomplishments of many kinds, and a sweetness of disposition that could not fail to win and retain friends, with abilities that raised him to one of the highest posts in the University at the early age of twenty-five, he started in the race of life with a bright prospect of success before him. His only fault, according to his brother, Lord Herbert, was that he was naturally quick-tempered, 'not exempt from passion and choler;' and Walton tells us, that 'if in his undergraduate life he expressed any error, it was that he kept himself too much retired, and at too great a distance from his inferiors; and his clothing seemed to prove that he set too great a value on his parts and parentage.'

¹ One of his biographers, Archdeacon Oley, 1652, describes his person, in rather ludicrous terms, as 'a contemperation of elegancies, and set of rarities to the beholder,' and speaks of 'his exquisite carriage.'

His allowance at college, we gather from his letters, though liberal, was not always sufficient for his rather expensive habits. Certainly in his after-life, as the 'country parson,' denying himself in every way for his parishioners, identifying himself with their homely lives, and lending a patient ear to every poor old woman who came with a story of distress, we see no traces of this reserve or exclusiveness, natural as it was to his fastidious delicacy of taste. He was the youngest but one of seven brothers, all men of note, and all apparently marked by a strong family likeness in high spirit and ability. The eldest, who raised himself to the rank of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, is well known to this day for his versatile talents as diplomatist and philosopher. The two next, Richard and William, after receiving a liberal education, served with distinction in the Low Countries, and were renowned according to the punctilious code of honour then in force, as duellists, Richard carrying twenty-four wounds with him to his grave at Bergenopzoom. Charles died young, a Fellow of New College. These four were George Herbert's seniors. But he seems to have been more closely drawn to the brother next after himself in age, who afterwards became Sir Henry, a favourite at court, at one time 'Master of the Revels,' and of course, like all the fine gentlemen of the day, famous in 'affairs of honour.' The youngest, Thomas, was a brave sailor. The brother of such men was not likely to be a bookworm.

George Herbert's naturally high spirits are evident in the few letters which remain, mostly belonging to the early part of his life. They are chiefly addressed from Cambridge to his brother Henry, and are very racy, considering the stiffness of letter-writing then in vogue. It is an instance of the chivalrous respect then paid to ladies, that while signing himself to Henry 'your loving brother,' he is 'your loving brother *and servant*' to his poor sick sister Elizabeth, wife of Sir Henry Jones. Writing to his brother at Paris, he tells him, 'be covetous of 'all good, which you see in Frenchmen, in knowledge, in 'fashion, in words;' and particularly in that 'wittiness of 'speech' which has always been a specialty of that nation. 'Let there be no kind of excellency which it is possible for you 'to attain to, which you seek not.'

About the same date he writes from Cambridge of having 'some forty businesses on hand,' and with equal relish of 'the gaynesses' incident to his office of public orator. In those days the Universities were in close communication with the Court, and to be distinguished at Oxford or Cambridge was a sure passport in political life. The office of 'public orator' was especially valued as an introduction to the Court; and a bright vista in that direction was opening itself to the young scholar-

courtier.¹ At first he hailed it gladly. Looking back afterwards on those sunny days from his quiet parsonage at Bemerton, he says :—

— 'my birth and spirit rather took
The way that takes the town.'

But it is not in the tone of vain regret. He thanks the guiding Providence which diverted him by his bad health from the glittering prizes of that highway to greatness to the '*fallentis semita vite*,' in which he was to serve God and his country. His intention of taking Holy Orders was clearly an afterthought; but that of leading a strictly religious life, even in the midst of secular avocations, clearly was not. He was not one of those, who, as Carlyle expresses it, 'go through a mud-bath in youth, in order to come out clean.' The dedication of all his powers to their highest use, whatever his way of life might be, at Court or in the University, was his fixed purpose from first to last, formed in very early life, and never laid aside for a moment, even in his 'fierce' youth, 'eager, hot, and undertaking,' as he himself describes it. In his first year at Cambridge he complains, 'many love-poems are daily writ and consecrated to Venus, few that look towards God and Heaven.' His delicate health was, no doubt, one cause that determined him to retire from the stirring scene of the Court. But he was also moved by a strong longing to raise the country clergy from the low estimation in which they were generally held, as the coffee-house squibs of that day show too plainly. Oley attributes this contempt of the clergy partly to the too indiscriminate admission of candidates first into the Universities, and thence into Holy Orders—for, as perhaps sometimes happens now, testimonials were given too much as a mere form—and partly to the general poverty of the country clergy, and the dearth of men of high family among them. It was a common thing then for their children to be apprenticed to trades. Herbert's 'Country Parson' is described as 'taking care not to put his children into 'vain trades, nor unbefitting the reverence of their father's 'calling, such as taverns for men and lacemaking for women.' Elsewhere chaplains are warned against being 'over-submissive and cringing,' and the rural clergy against haunting alehouses and taverns.² Herbert resolved to set himself to rescue the

¹ Oley says, 'he might have had a secretary of state's place, *like other orators*.'

² Clearly it was not their poverty so much as their low tastes and pursuits that degraded them. The circumstances of the present day seem imperatively to require that neither low birth, nor scanty means, nor even a less perfect education than usual for gentlemen, should stand in the way of the admission of fit persons into holy orders, at least into the diaconate, for missionary work at home and abroad.

high vocation of the clergy from this loss of caste and consequent loss of influence.

But it was not without a severe inward struggle that he decided on that renunciation of pursuits, otherwise innocent, which the consecration of a man's life to the work of the ministry demands. If he came late to the work, he did not come empty-handed. Crowned with academical honours, and graced with the prestige of high social position, he brought his abilities, his reputation, his prospect of worldly success, and freely devoted them all to the work. He could truly say in a short poem, called the 'The Pearl,' that he knew the ways of learning, the ways of honour, the ways of pleasure, of love, of wit, of music, and, as Walton adds, 'he knew on what terms he renounced all 'these for the service of his Master.' In another poem, 'The Quip,' he personifies 'Beauty, Money, Glorie, and Wit,' as severally assailing him with raillery for his neglect of their fascinations; to each and all he replies by turning to his heavenly Master:—

'But Thou shalt answer, Lord, for me.'

Not as one seeking in the cool shadow of the Church a refuge from the glare of worldly disappointments, but with humble thankfulness, as feeling unworthy of the office, he undertook the responsibilities of the ministry. After retiring for a year to his brother Henry's house in Kent, there to pause before taking the irrevocable step, he was ordained deacon in 1625; and after four years passed in deacon's orders (for he imposed on himself this unusually long period of probation, and his diffidence was hardly overcome at last by the persuasions of Lord Pembroke and Laud, then Bishop of London), he was ordained priest, and appointed to the small rectory of Bemerton, in 1630, being then in his thirty-seventh year. His resolutions, formed on the eve of induction, and the rules which he then laid down for himself, are recorded by Walton. We must extract part of them. 'I beseech that God, who hath honoured me so much as to call me 'to serve at His altar, that as by His special grace He hath put 'into my mind these good desires and resolutions, so He will by 'His assisting grace give me ghostly strength to bring the same 'to good effect. And I beseech Him that my humble and 'charitable life may so win upon others as to bring glory to my 'Jesus, whom I have this day taken to be my Master and 'Governor. And I am so proud of His service, that I will 'always observe and do His will; and will always call Him '*Jesus my Master*. And I will always condemn my birth or any 'title or dignity that can be conferred on me, when I shall 'compare them with my title of being a priest, and serving at

'the altar of *Jesus my Master*.' In one of his poems he turns again and again with fresh delight to these words:—

'How sweetly doth "*my Master*" sound "*my Master*."'

With all his self-discipline and devotion George Herbert was not a man to be happy alone. Some little time before this crisis in his life he married a daughter of Mr. Danvers (a name well known in the county), of Bainton, in Wilts, a member of the same family as Lord Danby. It was a very short courtship. Walton naïvely says, 'she changed her name into Herbert on the third day after their first interview.' But, to say nothing of love at first sight, their families were already connected, and they had heard so much of each other through friends, that they met for the first time not as strangers, but as if long acquainted. 'They wooed so like princes,' Walton explains, 'as to have select proxies, such as were true friends to both parties.' One is reminded for a moment of Richard Hooker and his extraordinary marriage. But the cases are quite different. That learned, but, for once, *injudicious* divine, simply acquiesced in the choice of the landlady of his lodgings, who took the opportunity of nominating her own daughter. The proof of marriage is of course in its consequences. Every one knows how poor Hooker was found by a former pupil vainly endeavouring to give his mind to the great treatise which he had on hand, while rocking the cradle amid the objurgations of his Xantippe. But Herbert's married life was singularly happy. His wife proved herself worthy of such a husband.

The rest of his life is soon told. For little more than two years he lived and worked among his parishioners, and then his short, but useful and happy life, was closed by a deathbed in perfect unison with all that had preceded it, serene and hopeful as a cloudless sunset. Two years and three months may seem a disproportionate space of time for his work in the ministry, after so long and so careful preparation for it. But it is not for us to call his death premature. To himself the old adage may safely be applied—'his wings were grown'; and, as for his work, it was ended. 'Non diu sed multum vixit.' His contemporaries complained that 'he lost himself in that humble way,' while devoting his energies to that obscure little parish. But his influence, in forming the highest type of Christian character for laity as well as clergy, has been extended, by his example and writings, far beyond the narrow limits of that little parish on Salisbury Plain, with its 'twenty cottages' and 'less than a hundred and twenty souls'—far beyond the age in which he lived.

It is not difficult, from hints contained in Walton's life, and

in his own sketches of the ideal 'country parson,' to form a tolerably complete idea of Herbert's daily life at Bemerton. The picture is a delightful one. His little church has lately been restored at great cost by the munificence of a lady worthy to bear the name, which he and others like him have ennobled in the highest sense of the word. As it stood in his day, with its low dovecote-like bell turret and narrow irregular windows, it must have been very like the homely but picturesque little churches which may still be seen often enough in Herefordshire, lingering amid other vestiges of the past in that old-fashioned district, and bearing witness, by their contrast to the statelier structures of the eastern counties, to the inferiority of western England in wealth and population. The romantic hills and dingles of Herefordshire are certainly as unlike as can be to the gently undulating plain about Bemerton. But there is, perhaps, no county which, at the present time, so nearly realises the truly pastoral relation which subsisted two centuries ago between a country parson and his people. In spite of the close vicinity of rampant Dissent in Wales, the old traditional respect for the Church and the clergy is still half-unconsciously cherished there among the peasantry and farmers; while each little parish seems to constitute only one large family, as described in Herbert's 'Country Parson,' with the parson himself acting in *propria persona*—not as in towns, through the mediation of curates and committees—the head and centre of everything that is going on, not excepting even the lesser and more trivial affairs of common life. In a little world of this sort we may imagine the poet-rector, loving and beloved by his flock, and revered by them not only for his office, but for his rank, learning, and sanctity—holding much the same position among them as the late Augustus Hare in his little parish on another of the Wiltshire plains. Herbert brought all the weight of his personal advantages to bear on his work, incommensurate to his powers, as it may seem, in worldly appreciation. He made his knowledge of the Platonic dialogues useful in the public catechising of the young people in church—a practice on which he set great store—borrowing the method of the sage, 'who taught the world as one would teach a child.' He used to entertain all his parishioners in turn at his Sunday dinner-table, welcoming the poorest with an especial share of that high-bred courtesy for which he was eminent even in a day when the etiquette of chivalry was still observed, and 'the grand manner' was more common among gentlemen than it is now. We may fancy him seated in his study, digesting his omnigenous stores of learning into a large common-place book—so he advises in 'The Country Parson'—but turning at any moment from the congenial occu-

pation to encourage any poor applicant for relief, who came to unfold a simple story of petty anxieties. His influence with the higher classes, always less amenable to such an influence, was as great as with the poor. 'There was not a man in his way,' writes Oley, '*be he of what rank he would*, that spoke awry in order to God, but Herbert would wipe his mouth (!) with a modest, grave, and Christian reproof.' He had a singular graciousness in reproving—always a disagreeable task—a dexterity in sweetening this art; a gentle yet uncompromising manner; a delicate tact in guiding conversation, which is wanting in persons of equal zeal, but less discretion. The eighteenth chapter of the 'Country Parson' gives some idea of this suavity and tenderness with unflinching firmness of manner; and, if such an art can be imparted by any rules, it may be by those laid down in the 'Church Porch.' Walton tells a story, illustrative of Herbert's winning manner, of his gaining a lasting influence for good over a gentleman living in Salisbury, by a short, casual conversation as they walked together, being previously unacquainted, on the road to that city. There must have been an irresistible charm about him, not the result of merely outward polish, but of innate sweetness of disposition and unselfishness, disciplined by the 'self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-distrust,' which were the results of his religion. It is no wonder that his flock followed him willingly, instead of being driven. 'When Mr. Herbert's Saints' bell [Sanctus-bell?] rang to prayers,' his neighbours, rich and poor, loved to resort to the little chapel adjoining his house, where the Church-service was daily performed 'at the canonical hours of ten and four.' Men 'would leave their plough to rest awhile, that they might offer their devotions to God with him, and then return to their work.' In our days of busy competition, even George Herbert would find it difficult to collect a large congregation in a small rural parish on a week-day. Herbert describes the country parson as observing the stated times of fasting and abstinence. The passage is characteristic of the man and his age. 'As Sunday is his day of joy, so is Friday his day of mortification, which he observes not only with abstinence of diet, but also of company, recreation, and all other outward contentments; and besides, with confession of sins and all acts of humiliation.' It was the general practice then. Of late years many religious persons have been deterred by fear of an observance which, more easily, perhaps, than any other, degenerates into formalism; while persons less serious have been only too glad to be freed from its restraint. Plainly, with George Herbert, it was no mere 'opus operatum.' There was no idea of anything meritorious in it. It was an ethical discipline for relieving the

'divinæ particula auræ' from the depressing burden of the 'corpus onustum.' His remarks in the tenth chapter show that he felt the obligation in the spirit rather than in the letter. 'If a piece of dry flesh at my table be more unpleasant to me than some fish there, certainly, to eat the flesh and not the fish, is to keep the fast-day naturally.' He goes on to say that fasting must never interfere with health, the preservation of sound mind in sound body being a paramount duty. We have dwelt at some length on this point, because the idea of Herbert and his contemporaries would be incomplete without it.

George Herbert was not one of those who sacrifice common everyday duties to those of a more directly religious kind, and who are so intent on the far distance as, in their abstraction, to be unconscious of the ground under their feet. The good parson is portrayed as exercising a general supervision, even over those departments of the household which do not usually belong to the 'pater-familias' to regulate. The following passage is very quaint. 'As he is just in all things, so he is to his wife also, counting nothing so much his own as that he may be unjust to it. Therefore he gives her respect both afore her servants and others, and half, at least, of the government of the house, reserving so much of the affairs as [may] serve for a diversion for him; yet never so giving over the reins but that he sometimes looks how things go, demanding an account, *but not by the way of an account.*'

His religion was not something distinct from the daily routine of life; it penetrated and ruled every action. If beggars, for example, come for alms, the parson takes the opportunity, before giving, of making them say their prayers, or the Creed, or the Ten Commandments; and as he finds them perfect, so rewards them the more. His own household was managed in the same spirit. The tie between master and servant was closer and more affectionate then:—'Besides the common prayers of the family, the parson straitly requires of all to pray by themselves, before they sleep at night and stir out in the morning, and knows what prayers they say, and *till they have learned them makes them kneel by him.*' Herbert knew well the truth of Michael Angelo's great saying, 'These trifles make up perfection; and perfection itself is no trifle.' His devotion, being sober and unfanatical, never obscured the homelier duties of life. When some friend objected that he was spending too much in almsgiving, he could answer that 'a competent maintenance was secured to his wife after his death.' His parish never made him forgetful of friends or relatives.

'Meliorne amicus, sponsus, an pastor gregis
Incertum est,'

is the verdict of Dean Duport.

To complete our sketch, inadequate at the best, of George Herbert, at Bemerton, we must think of him as gracefully unbending at times from the tension of work, and joining in such social recreations as accorded with his profession. Twice a week, after walking in to Salisbury for the cathedral service, which it was 'his heaven upon earth' to attend, he would spend part of the evening 'at some private musical meeting, where he would usually sing and play his part.' We may imagine him, as really happened once, stopping on his walk, 'like the good Samaritan, and putting off his 'canonical coat to help a poor man with a poorer horse that 'was fallen under his load.' He arrived in Salisbury in such a state that his musical friends there 'began to wonder that 'Mr. George Herbert, who used to be so trim and neat, 'came into that company so soiled and discomposed.' We may fancy him, rod in hand, strolling along the river side, one of the 'gentle anglers' whom his friend Walton commemorates, shaping into verse his sacred meditations. Certainly a life like this, in which work and rest, self-discipline and natural impulse, secular duties and heavenly aspirations, are blended into harmonious unity, as in one of those rich strains of music, now grave, now joyous, but always duly measured, which he loved to follow; a life in which the coarser threads of existence are inextricably intertwined with, and transfigured by the radiance of, the more ethereal filaments; in which the calmness and equanimity which the Roman poet vainly longed for seems attained; is the highest and most complete development of human nature possible on earth. Monastic seclusion may secure peace by eliminating the elements of discord. 'They make desolation and call it peace.' A life like Herbert's calls into action all the component parts of our organization, and consecrates them severally to their appointed use.

It is his largeness of mind, quickness of sympathy, and practical sense, that we have been especially endeavouring to illustrate in George Herbert, for of his learning and piety there can be no question. We commend his life and works to the admirers of 'muscular Christianity.' True, Herbert had no share in Mr. Kingsley's horror of anything like asceticism, nor so unreserved a confidence in the undisciplined impulses of nature; still, they agree well in the warm appreciation of whatever is noble and beautiful, whether in the moral or material universe, and particularly in the great truth

that the work and excellence of man lies *in* the world and not *out* of it, and has a fruition in this life, though not in this life only. We might often fancy that we are reading the more didactic parts of 'Westward Ho!' or 'Two Years Ago,' in the genial, plain-spoken, thoroughly fresh and real moralisings of Herbert. Some few extracts we must give (for his condensed wisdom loses much by dilution), chiefly those bearing on the secular aspects of life. In the 'Parson's Survey,' not of his own parish only, but of what is now called 'the spirit of the times,' for the good parson is described as being also a good citizen, Herbert speaks of idleness among the young nobility as the 'great national sin of the times.' It seems to have been one of the newest fashions imported from France and Italy; as Shakespeare writes of a lackadaisical youth—

'For I remember, when I was in France,
Young gentlemen would be sad as night;
And all for wantonness.'

To remedy this evil (one not peculiar to that century), Herbert prescribes manly occupations. He recommends the young nobility to learn farming; to act as magistrates; to study civil law, the basis of international relations, and therefore especially useful to statesmen and diplomatists; to improve themselves by travelling abroad; "to ride the great horse"—that is, to acquire the accomplishments of the tiltyard. No doubt, if alive now, he would add the rifle corps to his list. His wisdom is not of a cloistered tone. On the other hand, it is far removed from the sharp practice of mere worldlings. It is, like the prudential maxims of the Book of Proverbs or Ecclesiasticus, the identification of duty with expediency. The 'Church Porch,' an introduction in verse to the other poems, reminds the reader of the best parts of Horace's Satires, not less by its 'pedestrian muse,' than by its shrewd wit and graceful pleasantry. It abounds in pithy sayings, such as may give a man not the manners only, but the principles and feelings of a true gentleman. Mr. Willmott well says, 'The "Church Porch" is a little handbook of rules for the management of temper, conversation, and business. Every child [?] ought to get it by heart.' Here is good advice tersely given:—

'Pitch thy behaviour low, thy projects high;
So shalt thou humble and magnanimous be.'

Here is a word for the over-sensitive:—

'Think not thy fame at every twitch will break.
By great deeds show that thou canst little do:
Then do them not.'

Beneath all the lighter raillery lies a profound vein of sentiment, the utterances of which sound like the voice of that great and wise king, who tried all things under the sun, and found them vanity. It is this keen sense of the ridiculous, as well as of the awful side of human life, which Shakespeare so well portrays in the melancholy Hamlet, and in the cheerier Pantagruelism of the young prince, the future hero of Agincourt. Herbert, in the same way, was one of the few who can realize at once the utter nothingness of even the greatest affairs of this life in one point of view, and the immeasurable importance of even the most trivial as forming the moral destiny. It is characteristic of him, that he translated the sensible little treatise on 'Temperance and Sobriety' of Ludovicus Cornarus, known to Italian scholars as Luigi Cornaro, of Padua; a delightful sketch of a hale and hearty old age, with rules for attaining it. Herbert seems to have had a peculiar aptness, both by nature and education, for casuistry; not for hairsplitting and sophistries, but for the 'noble art,' as he rightly calls it, of solving the perplexing cases of conscience which occur every day. His way of cutting these knots, or rather of disentangling them, is thoroughly English. It is the evidence of a healthy moral sense, practised in logic, but with its own unerring instincts unblunted. A few examples must suffice. He shows when it is wrong, and when not, to take usury—to inform against a neighbour—to omit customary acts of devotion; how far tears and other physical accompaniments of contrition are really essential or only accidental to it—how persons may test their motives in seeking preferment. On the question which often perplexes the benevolent, of giving relief to unworthy applicants, he advises to give *most* to those of best character, but *something* to any in distress; for evident miseries 'have a natural privilege and exemption from all laws.' His 'proverbs,' some apparently his own, others merely collected by him, which the reader will find among his greater works under the title of '*Jacula Prudentum*,' leave hardly anything in life untouched. We quote at hazard two of the pithiest:—

'Marry your *son* when you *will*, your *daughter* when you *can*.'

'Buy at a fair, sell at home.'

We refer our readers to the rest, if they value the guidance of Herbert's aphorisms in the mazes of life.

The '*Country Parson*' is, of course, the book by which Herbert is best known. Though intended primarily for the clergy, it is a book to delight readers of any profession by the charming series of portraits which it unfolds of the good pastor

in almost every conceivable attitude and grouping.¹ Oley, in his day, feared only that an ideal so faultless 'would make the laity discontented.' There can be no danger of this, now that so many of the clergy strive to raise themselves to Herbert's high standard. The literary merits, too, of the book are great. There is no fine writing in it; there are no grand passages. But the language throughout is choice, scholarlike, and equable; singularly simple, exact, and terse; above all, it is in perfect keeping with the ideas to be conveyed. If, indeed, the great thing in style is, as Aristotle teaches, to be 'clear and pleasing,' if the language ought to fit as closely yet easily to its ideas as a well-made dress to the limbs, then Herbert's prose must be ranked high. It is like a well-dressed person. The reader is unconscious where its charm lies; but if he change a word, or the place of a word, or add or take away anything, he discovers how exquisite, yet to all appearance, unstudied, is the composition. In this '*curiosa felicitas*,' Herbert's style resembles that of his friend, Lord Bacon. It is entirely free from the euphuism then in fashion at court, and its graceful ease is the more remarkable, considering the ponderous manner of the learned men of the day. Hallam, in his '*History of Literature*,' passes by the '*Country Parson*' too summarily. While allowing to it the faint praise of being 'a pleasing little book,' he objects that 'its precepts are sometimes so overstrained according to our notions as to give an appearance of affectation.' So much the worse, then, for us and 'our notions.' But a book on the life and habits of a country parson was not much in Hallam's way; nor was he likely, from the associations which environed him, to free himself from an unintentional prejudice against the theological school, in which, according to his 'notions,' Herbert would be classed. To the charge of being 'overstrained,' it is enough to answer that the precepts in question were laid down by the author as 'rules and resolutions' for his own guidance. 'He set the form and character of a 'true pastor,' he says, 'as high as he could, for himself to aim 'at'; and he practised what he taught. Many useful manuals for the clergy have been written lately, testifying to their revived earnestness in their professional duties: Evans' '*Bishopric of Souls*,' Oxenden's '*Pastoral Office*,' Monro's '*Parochial Work*,' Heygate's '*Ember Thoughts*,' Bishop Wilberforce's '*Ordination Addresses*,' and Blunt's admirable '*Lectures on the Parish Priest*.' But the '*Country Parson*' can never be superseded.

¹ There is *one* curious omission. Not a word is said on the delicate relation between incumbent and curate. A chapter on the '*Parson and his Curate*' would have been useful to both parties. Herbert's silence on this point is the more surprising, from his having had a curate himself.

Short as it is and unassuming, it is inexhaustible in its suggestiveness. Walton says, 'He that can spare 12*d.* and yet 'wants a book so full of plain, prudent, and useful rules, is 'scarcely excusable.' It will never be obsolete. Here and there may occur something inapplicable to modern usages. Now that the ties of neighbourhood are less binding, it is not likely that, 'in case of any calamity by fire or famine to a parish,' all the inhabitants of an adjoining parish would go in procession, with the parson at their head, 'to carry their collection of alms themselves, to cheer the afflicted.' Nor would it be generally practicable now, though something similar is customary in some hotels, for the 'parson on journey' to assemble his fellow-travellers 'in the hall of the inn' for family prayers, 'with a due blessing of God for their safe arrival.' Still, in both cases, the principle holds good. Generally, his advice may be taken literally. His advice, for example, on the way of reproving, is as true now as then, and much needed by many zealous young clergymen. 'Those whom he finds idle or 'ill employed, he chides *not at first*, for that were neither civil 'nor profitable, but always *in the close*, before he departs from 'them: yet in this he distinguisheth; for if it be a plain 'countryman, he reproveth him plainly, for they are not sensible 'of fineness; if they be of higher quality they commonly are 'quick and sensible, and very tender of reproof, and therefore 'he lays his 'discourse so that he comes to the point very 'leisurely, and oftentimes as Nathan did, in the person of 'another, making them to reprove themselves.' Again, his remarks on reading the prayers in church are very seasonable, while complaints are heard continually of the bad elocution of the clergy; of their 'gabbling' in one church, of their 'drawling' and 'mouthing' in another. The parson's manner is thus described:—'His voice is humble, the words treatable [*sic*] and 'slow; yet not so slow as to let the fervency of the suppliant 'hang and die between speaking; but with a grave earnestness 'between fear and zeal, *pausing, yet pressing*, he performs his 'duty.' We would not, however, recommend our clerical readers to follow him implicitly, when he assigns no less than 'one full hour' as the time not to be exceeded in preaching; for the diffusion of books has changed the functions of the pulpit. There are preachers who may profit by his advice against over-analysing a text. The old story of 'let us *top* this "*but*"' finds its counterpart in some pulpits in our day. On the difficulties of parochial work, there is much to be learnt from the 'Country Parson;' for example, on avoiding the danger of bribing the poor into an unreal profession of religion, while rewarding the most deserving.

One of the most beautiful and characteristic chapters in the book is 'the parson on Sunday.' In the description of Sunday as a joyous, as well as holy day, equally free from the interruption of wordly cares, and from the dull vacuity and gloom of ultra-sabbatarians, we see the cheerfulness of his religion. 'On the Sunday before his death,' writes Walton, 'he rose 'suddenly from his couch, called for one of his instruments, and 'having tuned it, he played and sang—

'The Sundays of man's life,
Threaded together on Time's string,
Make bracelets to adorn the wife
Of the eternal glorious King.'

Very beautiful, again, is the chapter on 'the parson in contempt.' Few, if any, clergymen can expect to go through their pastoral duties without incurring some degree of obloquy; too often in proportion to their fidelity to their charge. Those who

'feel bowed to earth
By thankless toil, and vile esteemed,'

may gather strength from Herbert's picture of a man, naturally sensitive like himself, raised above the susceptibility of injuries or affronts, 'showing that reproaches touch him no more than a stone thrown against heaven, *where he is and lives*.' But it is endless to make extracts. We must refer our readers to the book itself. Only one word more for the younger clergy, and we have done. They are in danger of becoming too much absorbed in their secular duties, of growing shallow and fussy, amid the countless distractions incidental to these days of penny magazines and penny savings' banks. They may learn from the 'Country Parson,' with his huge 'body of divinity,' a 'book digested by himself out of writers old and new; the store-house of his sermons,' that they must rescue some portion of every day from such secular avocations, however laudable, as may be better discharged by lay agency, in order, by patient study, to lay a solid foundation of learning, especially in that great province of knowledge which is peculiarly their own.

Herbert's contributions to our controversial theology are less than might be expected from so learned and profound a theologian. He was naturally averse to publishing; and many of his manuscript papers were lost in the fire at Highnam House: besides, his early death may have prevented more. All that remains is gold, fine and unalloyed. In his short preface to his friend Ferrar's edition of the 'Divine Considerations of John Valdesso'—the companion of Charles V., first in his campaigns, afterwards in his retirement from the world—he touches cursorily, but with a master-hand, on several of the

great questions now agitating men's minds in England, his candour and comprehensiveness of intellect, and what may be called philosophical intuition, qualifying him peculiarly to answer such doubts and difficulties as are propounded in the 'Essays and Reviews,' so far as they came before him. He is so free from the conventionalities of religious phraseology, so philosophical, so calmly judicial, and, at the same time, so thoroughly real and earnest in his convictions, that whatever falls from him in defence of received truths carries no slight weight. Thus, while expressing the deepest reverence for the written Word of God as unfathomable in its meaning, or, to use his own words, 'ever teaching more and more,' he does not shrink from using the plainest language about such actions there recorded even of eminent saints, as would be censured in ordinary men. But he adds, 'it is one thing not to judge, another to defend them.' It is not, however, by passages directly bearing on the questions mooted in 'Essays and Reviews,' so much as by his general characteristics as a theologian, that Herbert's writings afford a solution of them. What especially marks his theology is, that reverence and free thought go hand in hand. He applies his consummate powers of reasoning to the question discussed, not as if himself standing aloof from it, or merely theorising on paper, but with intense personal conviction, and as qualifying the laws of thought by the plain dictates of common sense and common morality. He seems capable of realizing a mystery, without its mysterious nature evanescing in his grasp. Whatever truth, however abstruse, he handles, ceases to be a mere bodiless abstraction, and becomes a living reality. Thus, with him every article of the Creeds is a substantial unity, incorporated into his very existence. Though well versed in all the philosophy of the schools, there are no cobwebs of idle speculation in his reasoning to be brushed aside, before arriving at the truth. All is real, definite, actual, so far as regards the knowledge attainable by man; beyond that he does not presume to pronounce. His superiority to that habit of mind which wastes its energies in objectless unsatisfying speculation, and his repugnance to the intrusion of unauthorized definitions and dogmatisings into the illimitable field of heavenly mysteries, are evidenced in these lines. He is speaking of—

'Divinities' transcendent sky,
Which with the edge of wit they cut and carve;
Reason triumphs, and faith lies by.
'Could not that wisdom, which first brought the wine,
Have thickened it with definitions?
And jagged His seamlesse coat, had that been fine,
With curious questions and divisions?

*Love God, and love your neighbour. Watch and pray.
Do as you would be done unto.
O dark instructions, ev'n as dark as day!
Who can these Gordian knots undo?*

It is the combination in Herbert's character of the practical and imaginative elements which renders him so eminently and thoroughly English.

He was by no means a partisan in theology. His orthodoxy was not of a partial and exclusive cast. He was one who would have symbolized heartily with the 'Evangelical' party in the fulness of their assertion of justification by faith: only, without losing sight of the other great truths handed down from apostolic times. He assents freely to Valdesso insisting on the supreme importance of faith; only adding, that from real faith all other graces are sure to spring. The words, 'I am less than the least of Thy mercies,' were ever in his thoughts and prayers. When his friends round his death-bed were reminding him of some good deeds which he had done, he replied, 'Not good unless sprinkled by the blood of Jesus.' He seems to have been as far removed from Arminian self-righteousness as from the licence of the Antinomians. Perhaps nothing better, in small compass, has ever been written on the great problem, how to reconcile free will and grace, than his lines, which begin—

'Lord, Thou art mine, and I am Thine.'

Again, on the vexed question of election, these few words speak volumes:—'The thrusting away of God's arm doth alone (and nothing else) make us not loved by Him.' It is a great loss that no copy remains of his 'Letter on Predestination,' which Bishop Andrewes valued so highly, that he always carried it 'in his bosom.' Herbert was one of the few who can appreciate the manifold aspects of every question as it may be regarded on this side or on that. He resembles Pascal in many ways; in fine wit, in profound, yet clear insight, in freedom from the narrowness of party spirit. His short poem against the invocation of saints is a remarkable instance of feeling duly balanced by judgment. He protests, elsewhere also, against Romanist errors, but always with temperance and consideration. No one need be surprised to find George Herbert identifying Papal Rome with Babylon, as if the matter did not admit of question. It was the way of his generation: a fact, which exposes the fallacy of an assertion, too often allowed to pass unchallenged, that the Reformers clung to the old tenets, and would have made a more sweeping reformation if living in these days. But this is not the place to pursue these theological questions. It is enough to repeat what no student of George Herbert's remains will deny, that it would not be easy to find a more perfect

representative than in him of the spirit of our English theology as embodied in our English Prayer-Book.

It remains to speak of Herbert's poetry. As might be expected, we find it almost ignored by critics like Ellis and Warton. 'Apage sus; non tibi spiro.' The former, in his 'Specimens of the Early English Poetry,' superciliously dismisses Herbert with a laboured antithesis, which betrays equal ignorance of the facts of Herbert's life and of the most salient features in his character. 'Nature intended him for a knight-errant, but disappointed ambition made him a saint!' Any one less Quixotic than George Herbert, or less like a man soured by worldly disappointment, can hardly be conceived. Warton, in a strange confusion of metaphors, speaks of Pope 'judiciously collecting gold from the dregs of Herbert, Gashaw,' &c. It would be nearer the mark to say, that Pope had penetration to detect the rich unpolished ore, strewn at random in Herbert's poems, and skill to give it new lustre by the charm of his elaborate workmanship. Hallam passes by Herbert's poetry without a word. Campbell, in his 'British Poets,' while devoting two or three pages apiece to the merest poetasters, can only spare the corner of a page, and half a dozen lines of preface, for George Herbert. But we must bear in mind the prejudices which rendered Herbert's writings 'caviare to the general' of late years. More surprising is it that Southey, in his continuation of Ellis, should mention Donne, Wither, and Quarles, without any notice of one certainly their superior as a poet. On the other hand, as we have seen, Herbert's poems made a great impression on the minds of the seventeenth century. Henry Vaughan bears witness to Herbert's influence as the originator of a new school in poetry. Baxter, the nonconformist, a man of no common ability, was a warm admirer of Herbert's poems. Even in our own day, the great poet-philosopher, Coleridge, again and again extols George Herbert, not as a man only, but as a poet. 'Let me add,' he writes in 'The Friend' [vol. i. p. 53], 'that the quaintness of some of his thoughts, not of his diction, than which nothing can be more pure, manly, and unaffected, has blinded modern readers to the general merits of his poems, which are for the most part *exquisite in their kind*.' In the 'Biographia Literaria' he speaks of the 'weight, number, and compression of Herbert's thoughts, and the simple dignity of the language.' He writes to his friend Mr. Collins, the Academician, 'Read "The Temple," if you have not read it.' Certainly, this is high praise from a great critic. Still, it must be owned that there is much in Herbert's poems to account for distaste on a first perusal. At first sight they seem, not here and there only, but throughout,

stiff, obscure, fantastic. Perhaps the reader casts aside the 'Sunday-puzzle,' as the late Bishop Blomfield nicknamed the 'Christian Year,' in utter perplexity, or with the exclamation which Plato provoked from a despairing student, 'Si nonvis intelligi, non debes legi.' But on a closer approach, and with patience, the mist clears off; and what seemed to be unsubstantial and impalpable conceits, 'airy nothings,' prove to have a form and substance well worth some trouble in deciphering. Coleridge says, truly, that the difficulty arises not from any fault in the expression, but from the very nature of the thoughts to be expressed. 'The characteristic of our elder poets,' and he cites Herbert as an instance, 'is the reverse of that which distinguishes more recent versifiers; the one (Herbert and his school) conveying the most fantastic thoughts in the most correct and natural language; the other, in the most fantastic language conveying the most trivial thoughts. The latter is a riddle of words, the former an enigma of thoughts.' Great allowance must be made for the influence of the Italian poets, with that fondness for quaint fancies, which may be seen in the frigid conceits and extravagant metaphors of Tasso and Ariosto—an influence from which Shakespeare himself was not exempt, as his atrocious puns show, and to which we may attribute the wretched acrostics of that period, in which it was the fashion for a lover to express his ardour, or a mourner his grief even on the memorial stone. Something, too, is owing to his patristic studies. As Oley says, 'You find in him the choicest passages of the fathers bound in metre.' Mr. Keble, again, characteristically traces much of this redundancy of imagery, 'and constant flutter of his fancy, for ever hovering round his theme,'¹ to an instinctive delicacy which shrank from exposing his religious feelings too openly before the eyes of the world. It is evident, also, that Herbert's neglect of poetical propriety was, in part, a reaction from the smoothness and unreality of the popular love songs of the day. In the last lines of a short poem, entitled 'Grief,' he gives way to the feelings of devotion struggling for a free utterance:—

Verses, ye are too fine a thing, too wise
For my rough sorrows; cease, be dumb and mute;
Give up your feet and sorrows for mine eyes,
And keep your measures for some lover's lute,
Whose grief allows him musick and a rhyme,
For mine excludes both measure, tune, and time—
Alas! my God!

In the same spirit he describes himself as at first seeking out 'quaint words and trim invention,' as fitting ornaments 'to

¹ *Prælect.* xxiv. quoted by Mr. Willmott.

deck the sense,' in speaking of 'heavenly joyes,' but at last abandoning the vain attempt, and resolving that he will, since

'There is in love a sweetness ready penned,
Copy out only that.'

Elsewhere he seems to long to rescue all the flowers of poetry, 'sweet phrases,' 'lovely metaphors,' 'lovely, enchanting language,' from all lower purposes, for a worthier use. We must remember, also, in criticising 'The Temple,' that it was not originally intended for publication. It was the literal transcript, where he found relief in recording his own religious experiences. On his death-bed he left 'this little book' for the hands of his friend Ferrar, adding, 'He shall find in it a picture of the many 'spiritual conflicts that have passed between God and my soul, 'before I could subject mine to the will of Jesus, my Master. 'If he can think it may turn to the advantage of any poor 'dejected soul, let it be made public; if not, let him burn it.' The too frequent recurrence of anticlimax, and even downright bathos, at the end of many of the poems, indicates that they were never properly revised by the 'last hand' of the author. All these considerations tend to avert the hasty condemnation which might otherwise fall on Herbert's poems as abrupt, rugged, and enigmatical; at any rate, they excuse the poet, even where they cannot alter our opinion of his poetry.

After all, it cannot be denied that Herbert, as a poet, never will and never can be a general favourite. The want of poetic diction—and it must be remembered that in his day the language of poetry was not yet recognised by tacit consent as distinct in many points from that of prose—the quaintness of his thoughts, and the homeliness of his phrases, are grave faults in the eyes of most people. Even the multiplicity and compression of his ideas make him unpopular, though it may satisfy a more critical taste, just as a thorough musician enjoys a closely compacted fugue more than flowing airs and melodies. His subject, too, is against him. The very names of his poems—'Faith,' 'Prayer,' 'Virtue,' 'Obedience,' 'Conscience,' to say nothing of other titles positively ludicrous to our modern ears—are a stumbling-block on the threshold, except to those who approach in a devout, or, as Coleridge preferred to say, 'devotional' spirit. To all others, the pervading sense of the unseen world in every line is as an unknown tongue, an unintelligible rhapsody. His words are, as the old Greek dramatists says, 'eloquent to those who go along with them,' but to none else. They are not likely to attract the uninitiated; their influence is rather in deepening and quickening religious feelings already existing. Like music in a minor key, his poetry does not command attention by a full

burst of sound, but quietly instils congenial musings into the attentive ear. All these causes are more than enough to relegate Herbert into the class of poets whose lot it must be 'to find fit audience, though few.' He would himself gladly acquiesce in such retirement, in the same spirit as that in which Wordsworth sings—

'Shine, poet, in thy place, and be content.'

Herbert's poetry can never be popular. But all true lovers of poetry will find hidden treasure there, if they have patience to search below the surface. There is the difficulty. It must be read *leisurely* to be appreciated. The eager, bustling spirit of our times is incapable, without some self-constraint, of comprehending those compressed utterances, the result of undisturbed meditation. Just as in a dimly-lighted room any one, who gives only a hurried glance, may turn away disappointed from a really fine painting, so it is only after a mental effort of fixed attention that the latent beauties of poetry like Herbert's can be descried. Then, and not till then, what seemed confused and meaningless comes out in light and shadow, disclosing the significance of even the minutest details. A short poem called 'Aaron' is an instance. Herbert is portraying the Christian minister as unworthy in himself, but as rendered worthy by the indwelling gifts of the great High Priest:—

'Holiness on the head;
Light and perfection on the breast;
Harmonious bells below, raising the dead,
To lead them unto life and rest:
Thus are true Aarons drest.

'Profaneness in my head;
Defects and darknesse in my breast;
A noise of passions ringing me for dead
Unto a place where is no rest:
Poore priest thus am I drest.

'Onely another head
I have, another heart and breast,
Another musick making live not dead,
Without whom I could have no rest:
In Him I am well drest.

'Christ is my onely head,
My alone onely heart and breast,
My onely musick, striking me ev'n dead;
That to the old man I may rest,
And be in Him new drest.

'So holy in my head,
Perfect and light in my deare breast,
My doctrine turned by Christ (who is not dead
But lives in me, while I do rest),
Come people; Aaron's drest.'

On a hasty reading, these lines sound as the merest extravagance. They are full of meaning to those who care to find it. The metre, too, is characteristic. At first, it seems cramped and inelastic; when grown more familiar to the ear, it has a plaintive sweetness of its own. Take, again, 'The Call':—

'Come my Way, my Truth, my Life;
Such a Way, as gives us breath;
Such a Truth, as ends all strife;
Such a Life, as killeth death.

'Come my Light, my Feast, my Strength:
Such a Light, as shews a Feast;
Such a Feast, as mends in length;
Such a Strength, as makes his guest.

'Come my Joy, my Love, my Heart:
Such a Joy, as none can move:
Such a Love, as none can part:
Such a Heart, as joyes in love.'

It only requires thought to see the deep connexion which underlies this string of apparently disconnected images.

Religious poetry is seldom of the highest order. The subject transcends human capacity: and the religious poet is liable to the danger of having his sensuous perceptions dimmed by the superior brightness of the immaterial world. Exceptions, indeed, there are few, but glorious. Among our countrymen, Milton stands alone in this category; Cowper, Keble, Trench, and some few others, occupying the next places. Many persons, who would otherwise never have dreamt of versifying, have published what is meant for poetry, solely under the promptings of strong religious feeling, as the prolific doggerel of our innumerable hymn-books testifies. To compare Herbert with the colossal genius of Milton would be preposterous. He is more nearly on a par with the others whom we have mentioned. If he wants their polished and musical diction, and is comparatively deficient in the variety of natural imagery and the tenderness of domestic pathos which belong to the poets of Olney and Hursley, he may be ranked above Keble in terseness and vigour, while his manly cheerfulness is a delightful contrast to the morbid gloom which throws its chilling shade over many of Cowper's most beautiful passages. In the general characteristics of profound and reflective philosophy, Herbert and Trench may be classed together. Between Herbert and Keble the resemblance is still more striking. The influence of the older poet is very perceptible throughout the 'Christian Year'—here and there in the very words of it.

It is interesting to trace the coincidences of these kindred minds. In the 'Flower,' which Coleridge calls 'a delicious

poem,' Herbert rejoices in the return of spring to the earth, and of spring-like feelings to his own heart, and proceeds:—

'These are Thy wonders, Lord of power,
Killing and quickening, bringing down to hell,
And up to heaven in an houre.
We say amisse
This or that is ;
Thy Word is all, if we could spell.' —P. 174.

In almost the same words, Keble exclaims:—

'These are Thy wonders hourly wrought,
Thou Lord of time and thought ;
Lifting and lowering souls at will,
Crowding a world of good or ill
Into a moment's vision.'

Sixth S. after Trinity.

In another place, Keble expresses the longing, such as even heathen philosophers felt, for the glorious emancipation of the immortal nature of man from its earthly elements:—

'Till every limb obey the mounting soul,
The mounting soul the call by Jesus given :
He, who the stormy heart can so control,
The laggard body soon will waft to Heaven.'

Twenty-third S. after Trinity.

The same thought occurs in Herbert:—

'Give me my captive soul, or take
My body also thither !
Another lift like this will make
Them both to be together.'

In both poets alike we see a natural inclination towards the attractions of the world checked by self-discipline:—

'I thought it scorn with Thee to dwell,
A hermit in a silent cell,
While, gaily sweeping by,
Wild fancy blew his bugle strain,
And marshalled all his gallant train
In the world's wondering eye.
I would have joined him, but as oft
Thy whispered warnings kind and soft
My better soul confest.
"My servant, leave the world alone ;
Safe on the steps of Jesus' throne
Be tranquil and be blest."'

First S. after Trinity.

So in 'The Quip,' which we have already referred to:—

'The merrie world did on a day
With his train-bands and mates agree
To meet together, where I lay,
And all in sport to jeer at me.'

And the 'merrie world' in the person of his representatives, 'Beautie,' 'Money,' 'Wit,' tries all his allurements, but in vain. Herbert writes, in his poem on 'Giddinesse':—

'Surely, if each one saw another's heart,
There would be no commerce,
No sale and bargain passe : all would disperse
And live apart.'

Keble has expressed the same idea more fully in his beautiful lines for the Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity:—

'Or, what if Heaven for once its searching light
Sent to some partial eye, disclosing all
The rude bad thoughts that in our bosoms night
Wander at large, nor heed love's gentle thrall.
'Who would not shun the dreary uncouth place?
As if, fond leaning where her infant slept,
A mother's arm a serpent should embrace;
So might we friendless live and die unwept.'

In both poets the consecutiveness of the ideas is often far from obvious, and must be sought beneath the surface. In Herbert there is less periphrasis in the expression of devotional feelings. Such outbursts as—

'Oh ! my dear God, though I am clean forgot,
Let me not love thee, if I love thee not !'

cannot be paralleled in Keble; they are characteristic of Herbert and of his age.

These parallel passages are interesting as marking the similarity of character which subsists in great and good men, even of very distinct individualities. The admirers of the 'Christian Year' will find much in 'The Temple' to remind them of their favourite passages. If 'The Temple' is never likely to exercise the extraordinary influence of the 'Christian Year'—an influence on the religious mind of England greater than has ever been exercised by any book of the kind, an influence extending itself imperceptibly even to quarters seemingly most alien—still it is a book to make a deep impression, where it impresses at all; and its influence is of a kind to percolate through the few to the many.

The resemblance between Herbert and Cowper is fainter; or rather a strong resemblance is qualified by equally strong traits of difference. Both poets have much in common with Horace, strange as any comparison may appear at first sight between them and the pagan poet of the licentious court of Augustus. They have no small share of his lyrical fervour, his adroitness in the choice of words, and in the adaptation of metres; and, in satire, the same light touch, the same suppressed humour, the same half-sportive, half-pensive strictures on the anomalies

of life. Both Herbert and Cowper love to dwell on the transitoriness of earthly pleasures; but there is this difference: Herbert oftener adds that man may enjoy them in moderation while they last:—

‘Not that he may not here
Taste of the cheer;
But as birds drink, and straight lift up their head,
So must he sip, and think
Of better drink
He may attain to, after he is dead.’—P. 134.

Both poets complain alike of times of religious depression; but Herbert's lyre is more often tuned to joy and thankfulness for refreshment and relief. He was naturally of a more hopeful temperament. But there are other causes to account for the difference. That distrustful dread of alienation from the favour of heaven, which, in religious minds of Cowper's school, seems even to overcloud the sense of reconciliation through the cross, was no part of Herbert's creed. On the contrary, it was the very essence of his faith, a source of unfailing strength, to regard himself and his fellow-Christians as having all the privileges of adoption within reach freely to enjoy. Again, while poor Cowper's mental vision was for ever introverted on himself, and busied with that dissection of transient phases of feeling which paralyses the healthy action of the soul, Herbert's glance was oftener turned to the great objective truths of Christianity, deriving from them support in the consciousness of infirmity. Here is the secret of the *cheerfulness* of his poetry. This vivid realization of the great external facts of Christianity is what distinguishes him from the 'erotic school' of Germany. But for this, he might be classed with many of the poets of the 'Lyra Germanica.' But his poetry, though instinct with the same glow of seraphic love, is more definite, more practical, less sentimental. There is in it more substance for the mind to take hold of, more suggestiveness of something beyond, less evaporation into mere transports of emotion. His expressions of devout love, however eager and impulsive, are always (as in a short poem called 'Artillerie') profoundly reverential. Love and obedience, faith and duty, are with him inseparable. This habitual attitude of mind toward the Deity, this filial feeling of love tempered by awe, is beautifully apparent in the closing lines of another poem:—

‘But as I grew more fierce and wild,
At every word
Methought I heard one calling “*Childe!*”
And I replied “*My Lord!*”’—P. 160.

We have endeavoured to illustrate particular traits in Herbert's character, rather than to select his finest passages. Some few of these we feel that we ought to cite before concluding, especially as our author is one not so well known as he deserves to be. The beautiful lines on 'Virtue,' beginning

'Sweet day, so cool, so calm, so bright,
The bridal of the earth and sky,
The dew shall weep thy fall to-night,
For thou must die.'—P. 85.

are perhaps the best known, being quoted in Campbell's 'British Poets' and elsewhere. They are singularly applicable to Herbert's own life and character, and are redolent of the sweetness and brightness of his disposition. The 'Sonnet,' if we may use the word out of its strict signification, on 'Time,' and the lines on 'Love Unknown,' were both favourites with Coleridge. The former has been well compared to a collect in the Prayer-Book in its perfect rhythm, and in the fulness and compactness of its meaning. The latter is a short allegory, highly imaginative, and rich in devotional feeling. We subjoin a specimen of Herbert's more philosophic poetry, not unworthy of Wordsworth:—

'Man is the world's high priest ; he doth present
The sacrifice for all, while they below
Unto the service mutter an assent,
Such as springs use that fall, or winds that blow.

* * * * *
'We all acknowledge both Thy power and love
To be exact, transcendent, and divine ;
Who dost so strongly and so sweetly move,
While all things have their will yet none but Thine.

'For either Thy permission or command
Lays hands on all."—P. 118.

Again, in 'The Search : '—

'Where is my God ? what hidden place
Conceals Thee still ?
What covert dare eclipse Thy face ?
Is it Thy will ?
O let not that of anything !
Let rather brass
Or steel or mountains be Thy ring—
And I will passe.
Thy will such an entrenching is
As passeth thought :
To it all strength, all subtleties
Are things of nought.
Thy will such a strange distance is,
As that to it,
East and west touch, the poles do kiss
And parallels meet.'

Our limits forbid any more extracts. We can assure our readers that, if they care to look for themselves, they will find many passages, not of a kind, perhaps, to make an immediate impression, but such as will approve themselves gradually more and more to a thoughtful and sympathising mind, and from which it may derive solace and strength.

Herbert's Greek and Latin poems need not detain us long. They evince his mastery over the idioms and metres of those languages; but like most classical compositions of his day, they seem harsh and strained, from the effort required to force the old languages to adapt themselves to modern ideas, for which they have no equivalent. His Latin letters are open to the same criticism. The redundancy of flowery compliments in them is also a fault of the period.

In our quotations we have referred to Pickering's edition of 1850, as being, in our opinion, the best extant. It is, as may be expected from the publisher's name, carefully and beautifully executed; in type and general effect perfectly in keeping with the author's age. The old spelling is retained, as in Mr. Keble's Hooker, and for the same reason, as assisting the reader to carry back his thoughts to the associations amid which the author lived and wrote. Mr. Willmott's edition betrays haste by its unpardonable inaccuracies both of spelling and punctuation, especially in the Latin letters, without even any list of the errata. In not a few poems the sense is quite obscured by their not being printed in form of dialogue. The notes, scanty and misplaced, are of little service, being attached generally to words that need no explanation, as, for instance, 'shrewd,' 'callow,' 'diurnall,' 'oblation,' 'glozing,' while passing by the few phrases that really present any difficulty. Mr. Willmott deserves thanks for adding a few short Greek poems: not that they are of any great value in themselves, but because they show the versatility of Herbert's genius, and his proficiency, not in Latin only (a common accomplishment in his day), but in the less trodden field of Greek literature. Mr. Willmott has done well in omitting 'The Synagogue,' a poor imitation, almost a caricature, of 'The Temple.' The omission of Walton's inimitable life is unaccountable; nor is it compensated for by the editor's own 'Introduction.' It might have been hoped, from an editor like Mr. Willmott, that he would have thrown some light on the connexion between the poet's life and particular passages in his writings. These omissions are the more to be regretted, as this edition is entitled to the credit of introducing an undeservedly neglected author in an attractive and popular form for general reading.

We have prolonged these remarks, we fear, beyond the

patience of our readers. In truth, we have been reluctant to quit a subject so fascinating. Men like George Herbert are rare. It is not his wide learning, nor his refined taste; not his high spirit, nor his amiability, nor even his strictness of life; it is not any of these qualities singly that distinguishes him: but the rare combination in one person of qualities so diversely beautiful. He was 'master of all learning, human and divine.' So writes his brother, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and his remains, few as they are, confirm this eulogy; yet his learning is not what strikes the reader most, it is so thoroughly controlled and subordinated by his lively wit and practical wisdom. He was exemplary in the domestic relations of life, 'tender and true' as son, husband, friend: yet he seems to have lived as a 'home-missionary' among his parishioners. He was a man of letters; yet ever condescending to the petty concerns of his poor ignorant clients: an ambitious man; yet he relinquished all worldly objects for the humble work of the ministry. He was, in a word, a man of extraordinary endowments, both personal and such as belonged to his rank—not lost in indolence nor wasted on trivialities, but all disciplined and cultivated to the utmost, and then devoted to the highest purposes. Men of a less evenly-balanced genius may create a greater sensation in the world; as the eccentric course of a comet may attract more notice than steadier and less startling luminaries. But it may be questioned whether the influence of men like George Herbert is not wider and deeper, though less perceptible, in the end. From them issue the hidden watercourses of thought and action that irrigate the world with ever fresh supplies of life and vigour by innumerable, unnoticeable rills, preserving its morality from corruption and stagnation. The influence of those who possess Herbert's natural ability, combined with his *solidity* of character, cannot be measured by what we see. It is to men of this metal that England owes her greatness—men, like him, of high spirit, strict principle, genial, practical energy—men who, over and above other fine qualities, are strong in that reality and earnestness on which we are apt to pride ourselves as peculiarly English. Such a hero, in the truest sense, England has but lately lost in Lord Herbert of Lea; such, in a different sphere of life, was his kinsman, the country parson of Bemerton. May the race of men like these never be extinct among our statesmen and our clergy! There is said to be a dearth of talent among the younger clergy now. The most promising young men in the universities, it is asserted, draw back from ordination, and prefer other professions. They may learn, from the example of George Herbert, how to devote their talents to a worthy end.

ART. VI.—*Missale ad Usum insignis et præclaræ Ecclesiæ Sarum. Pars Prima: Temporale.* Burntisland: e Prelo de Pitsligo. Londini: Veneunt apud C. J. Stewart. 1861.

THERE can be no doubt that the volume which stands at the head of this Article will form an epoch in the science of Ecclesiology. When we remember how difficult a thing it was to procure any copy of the Sarum Missal, at what a price the worst editions had to be purchased, how the increased study of the book augmented the cost by which it was to be obtained, it would have been a boon to English Churchmen, the value of which no words could express, to have their own original and dear service-book, to have that most precious work of S. Osmund, brought within the reach of the poorest scholar. But when, in addition to this, the Sarum Missal is presented to us with all its various readings, culled from a variety of editions which we shall hereafter particularize, so that we now have in our hands what must of necessity hereafter be esteemed the classical edition of our national Liturgy, we know not how we can return sufficient thanks to the promoter and principal editor of this publication. With the exception of one portion—and against that we shall be obliged to enter a protest—we can conceive no Christian work, such as this pre-eminently is, more laboriously, more scholarly, if we may use the word, more nobly performed than this has been. If our readers think that we are employing terms more enthusiastic than the volume itself warrants, we could not be satisfied to say less, especially as we shall have some censure to mingle with our praise. In the meantime, so far as the *Christian Remembrancer* has a right to speak for the Ecclesiastical students of the English Church, we confess to a debt of gratitude which, as it never has been incurred before, so, in the very nature of things, never can a second time be due to an equal benefit.

Before we proceed, we are bound to express our admiration of the way in which the volume has been 'got up.' Those who are acquainted with the Pitsligo Press, will only see in this Mr. Forbes's masterpiece; those who are not, will wonder that, under the direction of a priest, women—mostly converts from Presbyterianism—should have a living found for them by sending forth volumes which (at all events to an unprofessional eye) may vie with the best specimens of professional printers.

The present volume contains the first half of the Missal only,

the *Temporale*; the *Sanctorale* is reserved for a future issue. We need scarcely, however, observe, that this first part is infinitely the more important of the two; partly because in this we go through that series of the Church's year which is dear to, and known by, every Western Christian; partly—which, indeed, is a consequence of the preceding consideration—here we are in complete possession of its contribution to 'comparative' Liturgiology.

A short previous notice prefixed to the work, promises a detailed account of the editions of the Sarum Missal, when the whole task shall be accomplished. Instead of giving any abbreviation of the two pages which contain this statement, we will allow the editor to speak for himself:—

'It is only necessary to explain that the editions of which use has been made in the present work are designated by the year of publication; "92" meaning the edition of 1492; "34" that of 1534, and so forth. When more than one edition was printed in the same year, they are distinguished by the initial of the place of publication placed after the date; and when there is ambiguity also as to the place, the initial of one of the printers or publishers follows; where no name of place occurs, the initial of the printer is given. Thus, the edition printed in 1527 at Paris by Prevost is represented by 27PP.; that printed by Regnault by 27PR.; and editions of the same year, printed at Antwerp, and by Byrkman with no designation of place, by 27A. and 27B. At the end of the copy of the last-mentioned edition, which is in the British Museum, occur a few leaves of a different edition, which have been designated for convenience 27L.

'When an edition bears two dates, it is denoted by a fraction: the edition begun in 1510 and ended in 1511 is denoted by $\frac{11}{10}$; so likewise $\frac{55}{54}$ denotes the edition printed in 1554 and 1555.

'M54. denotes the Sarum Manual of that year; P with a figure following it, is the Sarum Processional of the year indicated; and B56. is the small Breviary of that year, printed at Paris.

'Before this edition was begun, a comparison of editions was made, sufficient to show a probable division into four or five classes, and some minor subdivisions. In the notes, only one edition of each class has been mentioned, except when it was observed that one edition differed from others of the same class.

'Wherever in the notes 94 occurs, the folio and the quarto printed at Venice in 1494 are represented, and also the very curious folio without date or place (probably earlier than the above editions), in the Gough Collection at the Bodleian and at the British Museum. This book, when it is referred to separately, is marked H.

'97. (of which there are copies in the Queen's Library at Windsor, in the British Museum, and belonging to the Duke of Devonshire) represents, 1. in the Douce Collection, 4PV. in the University Library at Cambridge, 8V. in the Gough Collection, and 10R. in the Bodleian and belonging to Mr. Mendham, as well as 27L. before referred to.

'15. (of which many copies exist) represents three other classes of editions—first, 3., secondly, the two Rouen editions of 8. and that of 9. (these three editions have much in common); and thirdly, the Rouen editions of 14. and 21.

'When this edition of the Missal was begun, it was conceived that twenty

editions; that of 1510 and 11 (designated by $\frac{11}{10}$), 13., 14P. and 27PP. (of which nineteen copies are known to exist), 16P., 19PH., 29. and 33. (of which sixteen copies are known), 21P., 26., 27A., 27B., 28. (of which fifteen copies remain), and 31., 32., 34., $\frac{55}{54}$, 55P., 55L., 55V. (of which thirty-four exist), differed very slightly from one another; as well as 19PR., 27PR., 30., and 54R. (of which fifteen copies exist), which had been less carefully examined; and that thus no less than ninety-nine copies would be found to differ but little from one another and might be taken as a kind of common standard edition. Circumstances also pointed out 26. as the edition most convenient to print from. But as the work went on, it was found that differences greater than had been anticipated existed between 13. and 26. and 55P.; and all that at present can be said is that 13. is believed to represent the first set of editions and (probably) the second; and that 26. represents the third, and the fourth also—where it is not noted that 55P. differs from it.

'The four Pynson editions, 0L., 4L., 12., and 20. have some features in common, sufficient to warrant the classing them together, along with the last edition, that of 57. and perhaps 0P. In the notes, where 4L. and 57. agree, they probably represent this class.

'The collations for this edition have been made by comparing together 94. and 57., 13. and 8RM.; and the Gradual with 4L. In these collations, no notice was taken of the variations in the Epistles and Gospels. While the work was in progress, 55P. was compared with 98. and 13.; and the results of all these collations compared afterwards with 92., 97., 15. and 26.'

In entering into further details, we must remind the reader that we are only fulfilling an engagement, made now some years ago, and worked out occasionally from that time to this, of examining in detail the principal offices of Christendom. We must therefore be forgiven if we here take for granted what we have elsewhere given reasons for believing; and assuming a knowledge on the part of our readers, which in foregoing articles has not been assumed.

The Sarum Missal, in the height of its glory, was in use through by far the greater part of England—that is to say, over that portion which lies southward of a line drawn from Chester to Lynn; it was, in spite of much opposition, the general use in Scotland; it was, to the best belief of the writer, though here he speaks on a most difficult subject, the national service book of Ireland; and, after the year 1390, or thereabouts, it was the office which extinguished all others in Portugal and Galicia, and which, to a great extent, prevailed in those Spanish dioceses that bordered on the before-named provinces.

But the editor has enriched the present work with extracts, by way of notes, from the Gradual—notes which it was utterly impossible for one scholar in a hundred otherwise to procure: Sarum Graduals being so excessively scarce, and, by consequence, commanding so high a price. Yet, without these annotations, some of the rubrics are utterly unintelligible, whilst some few even yet are, to say the least, obscure. We should

recommend that, as an appendix to the whole work, a ground-plan of the cathedral, as it existed in the fifteenth century, should be subjoined; the various elevations of the choir and sanctuary, the principal stalls and subsellæ, the altar arrangements, and everything else connected with the celebration of the Liturgy, being distinctly mapped out. Every ritualist who has really studied the rubrics of that Church which—we hope it is not national pride which leads us to say so—was, by the confession of all, the first Cathedral Church in Christendom as to ritual, must have felt himself sorely perplexed by the apparently contradictory directions given by them—directions which, we think, can only be explained on the supposition that the building was rearranged from time to time, while the ritual laws were varied in practice, but remained the same in letter.

If we class the Sarum Missal in its proper family, we shall find it occupying a position among those of the north and south-west of France, and of the whole of England, moulded apparently on the Missal of the Primatial Church of Rouen, but modified by the use of the Abbey of Bec: it, in its turn, reformed and reacted on by the whole of the churches which then owned English dominion. Of these, the principal were: Rouen, as we have said; next to that, S. George de Boscherville; then the Abbey of Jumièges, the mother of Notkerian Sequences; the rituals of Evreux, of the once famous Lisieux, of S. Lo, Caen, Bayeux, Amiens, S. Quentin, Fécamp; and, in the south-west of France, Bayonne, the leading ritual of that part of the country. In the beginning of the fifteenth century, by means of Lisbon, it had acted on Braga, Evora, Coimbra, and on the enormous abbey churches of Batalha and Alcobaça; while, penetrating into Spain, it had most distinctly influenced Tuy; in some small degree even S. Iago de Compostella; and, to a certain extent, Badajoz, Zamora, and Guarda.

We will now, in continuation of the papers which we have in former numbers devoted to comparative Liturgiology, compare some of the features of our own national rite, the *Usus Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, as some of the later Missals have it, with the Roman Liturgy, as the general touchstone of all, with the Rouen, and with our own modern Prayer-Book. We have previously spoken so much of the arrangement of Collects and Gospels, that we shall now take the Epistles in due course, and shall, as we go through them, notice any remarkable peculiarity of the *Usus insignis et præclaræ Ecclesiæ Sarum*.

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.]

Sarum. Rom. xiii. 11—14.
English. Rom. xiii. 8—14.

Rouen. As Sarum.
Roman. Rom. xiii. 11—14.

The propriety of the Epistle is evident: it would be harder to say why the Prayer-Book takes the three earlier verses (8—11), which have no bearing on the subject, and spoil the exordium of the Church's year.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

All. Rom. xv. 4—13.

This Epistle is universal. The ritualists have nothing better to say on it, than that the mention of hope in the first verse, naturally leads us to the consideration of 'that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour JESUS CHRIST.'

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

<i>Sarum.</i>	} 1 Corinth. iv. 1—5.	<i>Roman.</i>	<i>Philip. iv. 4—7.</i>
<i>English.</i>			
<i>Rouen.</i>			

The Sarum and our own have a manifest reference to the Ember weeks which must follow; the Roman is surely not so appropriate here, as (where we place it) on the fourth Sunday. The counterchange of Epistles is singular. The German books follow us.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

<i>Sarum.</i>	} <i>Philip. iv. 4—7.</i>	<i>Roman.</i>	<i>1 Corinth. iv. 1—5.</i>
<i>English.</i>			
<i>Rouen.</i>			

CHRISTMAS DAY.

<i>Sarum.</i>	1. Tit. ii. 11—15.	<i>Rouen.</i>	} As Sarum.
	2. Tit. iii. 4—7.		
	3. Heb. i.		
<i>English.</i>	Heb. i.		

taking the second Epistle for our second Evening Lesson.

But we will break the monotony of our list by giving an imitation of the very curious 'farced' Epistle (we have before explained the term) in the *Missa ad Gallicantum*; but only '*ubi habetur cantus.*'

¶ Let two clerks of the second form, in silk copes, together, in the Roodloft, chant the lection.

*For ever and for ever will I sing
The praises of the heavenly Lord and King,
Who formed us by His Hand; and saved from loss
By the Son's purple Blood upon the Cross.*

¶ And now alternately

A LECTON OF ISAIAH THE PROPHET.

*Wherein the Saviour's glittering birth
Is prophesied to all the earth.*

Thus saith the LORD :

*The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
By Whom were made the heavenly host :*

The people that walked in darkness—

*The people whom Thy hand hath made ;
The people who from Eden fell
By Satan's malice ; who, betrayed,
Were by Abaddon dragged to hell.*

Have seen a great light ;

*When, in the watches of the night,
The Angel-watches shone so bright.*

To them that sat in darkness, and the shadow of death, light

*Light and redemption all our own,
To future ages to be known,*

Hath sprung up.

*O admirable mystery !
O wonderful Nativity !*

For unto us a Child is born :

*He shall be great :
Jesus the Son of God Most High.*

Unto us a Son

Of Him That dwelleth in the sky

Is given :

As prophecies, revealed from heaven, relate.

And the government shall be upon His shoulder :

*That heaven above and earth below
His principality may know.*

And His name shall be called

Messias, Soter, Emmanuel, Sabaoth,¹ Adonai,

Wonderful

Root of David,

Counsellor

Of God the Father.

God,

Who all things by His word hath made.

The Mighty,

Who hell's foul gates in ruin laid.

The Everlasting Father,

*The Lord of lords, and King of kings,
Omnipotent o'er men and things.*

¹ A line from the Hymn (or Sequence) *Alma Chorus*.

The Prince of Peace,

That shall not cease.

Of the increase of His government

*At first in Hierosolyma,
In Jewry, and Samaria,*

And peace there shall be no end

Long as eternal years extend.

Upon the Throne of David and upon His Kingdom,

*And of that Kingdom shall be found
No limit or material bound :*

To order it,

(In faith to wit,)

And to establish it with judgment and with justice,

*When He, the Judge from Heaven, shall come
To call the world to final doom.*

From henceforth

*All laud and praise to Him is due,
And jubilation ever new,*

Even for ever.

¶ And now they both sing the rest together.

*From lands that see the sun arise,
To earth's remotest boundaries,
All nature raise her thankful strain,
And all the people say, Amen.*

With all our reverence for the rite of S. Osmund, we must call this perfectly intolerable ; Isaiah-and-water.

We now proceed.

CIRCUMCISION.

English. Rom. iv. 8—13.

Sarum. } Titus ii. 11—15.
Rouen. }
Roman. }

The English Epistle is a curious example of the subjective character of the later book ; and probably also chosen for its reference to justification. Durandus gives no hint of its having been used in his time, nor can we find it in any other Missal.

EPIPHANY.

English. Ephes. iii. 1—9.

Sarum. } Isaiah lx. 1—6.
Rouen. }
Roman. }

Again, in our present book, the instruction of the Epistle, rather than the rapture of the Prophecy ; which, however, forms the Lesson.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Rouen.</i>	{	Isaiah lx. 1—6.	<i>Roman.</i>	{	Rom. xii. 1—5.
<i>Sarum.</i>			<i>English.</i>		

The Sarum does not, like the English and Roman, call this Sunday the First after Epiphany, but that within the Octaves: whence the Epistle is taken.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Sarum.</i>	Rom. xii. 1—4.	<i>Rouen.</i>	{	Acts iv. 8—12.
<i>English.</i>	Rom. xii. 6—16.	<i>Roman.</i>		

The Roman Epistle refers to the festival observed on this Sunday: that of the Name of JESUS.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

All. Rom. xii. 16—21.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Sarum.</i>	Rom. xii. 16—21.	<i>Roman.</i>	{	Rom. xiii. 8—10.
<i>English.</i>	Rom. xiii. 1—8.	<i>Rouen.</i>		

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Rouen.</i>	{	Rom. xiii. 8—10.	<i>Roman.</i>	Col. iii. 12—17.
<i>Sarum.</i>				
<i>English.</i>	Colos. iii. 12—19.			

The Sarum and Rouen Epistle is peculiar to these Churches. The German Missals have usually no proper Epistle, repeating that of the Fourth Sunday. Durandus mentions that which we have; and which we clearly borrowed from Rome.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

<i>Rouen.</i>	{	Colos. iii. 12—19.	<i>Roman.</i>	1 Thessal. iii. 1—10.
<i>Sarum.</i>				
<i>English.</i>	1 S. John iii. 1—8.			

There can be no doubt that the English Epistle, 'we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him,' is the best: so often as that Sunday's office precedes Advent. The Roman is a late addition: in the time of Durandus no Church had any.

SEPTUAGESIMA.

<i>Rouen.</i>	{	1 Corinth. ix. 24—27.	<i>Roman.</i>	1 Corinth. ix. 24—x. 5.
<i>Sarum.</i>				
<i>English.</i>				

The German books, so far as we have examined them, agree with the Roman in carrying on the lection into the next chapter. It certainly makes the sense much more complete:—
'lest . . . I myself should be a castaway: for I would not that

ye should be ignorant . . . that with many of them'—them to whom such privileges were given, God was not well-pleased.' Durandus, though not exactly saying so, *seems* to end it as the Sarum.

SEXAGESIMA.

Sarum. 2 Corinth. xi. 19—xii. 9. *Rouen.* } 2 Corinth. xi. 19—xii. 9.
English. 2 Corinth. xi. 19—21. *Roman.* }

But the Sarum has a rubric (in all editions but that of 1498) that, if the Epistle be said in the week, it is to begin at xi. 32.

QUINQUAGESIMA.

All. 1 Corinth. xiii.

There needs no explanation why at the time in which 'all our doings' are more especially to be devoted to our LORD's glory, we should ask to be endued with that grace without which 'nothing' can be 'worth' in His sight. We may observe that the Sarum books retain, to a very great extent, the ancient use by which Lent was not commenced till that which we now call, its First Sunday. Although this is more remarkably the case in the Breviary, it may also be noticed in the *Graduale* and *Complenda* of the Missal.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT, or *Invocavit*.

All. 2 Corinth. vi. 1—11.

And here, again, there is no difficulty as to the sense: 'Behold now is the accepted time.' The Epistle is the same in the Mozarabic and Ambrosian rites.

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT, or *Reminiscere*.

All. 1 Thess. iv. 1—7.

All the ritualists remind us that as, first and foremost among our spiritual enemies, comes the lust of the flesh—that sin of impurity against which the Epistle warns us; so here, first of all in Lent, the more general occasion of the Fast having been previously stated, we are brought face to face with this. One remark must necessarily strike every English Churchman: the miserable loss which we have sustained by the omission of the week-day Epistles and Gospels, during the great Forty Days. Take, for example, the course of the Liturgy for this especial week, the week in which we are now writing.

MONDAY.

The Collect.

We beseech Thee, O LORD, pour Thy grace into our hearts; so that as we

abstain from carnal meats, so we may hold back the flesh from every hurtful excess. Through Thy SON, our LORD JESUS CHRIST: Who.

The Epistle.

2 Kings v. 1—15. (The History of Naaman.)

The Gospel.

S. Luke v. 23—30. (About the many widows that were in the land of Israel, during the days of Elijah.)

TUESDAY.

The Collect.

Hear us, Almighty and merciful GOD; and of Thy mercy grant to us the gifts of salutary continence. Through.

The Epistle.

2 Kings v. 1—7. (About the miraculous multiplication of the oil.)

The Gospel.

S. Matth. xviii. 15—22. (About telling a brother's fault to the Church.)

WEDNESDAY.

The Collect.

Grant, we beseech Thee, O LORD, that we, being instructed by salutary fasts, and also abstaining from hurtful vices, may the more easily obtain Thy pardon. Through our LORD.

The Epistle.

Ex. xx. 12, to the end. (From the beginning of the Second Table of the Commandments to the ordinance about altars.)

The Gospel.

S. Matth. xv. 1—20. (Our LORD's rebuke of the Pharisees about *Corban*, &c.)

THURSDAY.

Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty GOD, that the holy devotion of these fasts may both bestow on us purification, and may render us acceptable to Thy Divine Majesty. Through.

The Epistle.

Jeremiah vii. 1—7. (About those who said, 'The Temple of the LORD are we.')

The Gospel.

S. John vi. 27—35. (Manna the type of the Blessed Sacrament.)

FRIDAY.

The Collect.

We beseech Thee, O LORD, favourably to behold our fasts; that, as we corporally abstain from food, so we may mentally restrain ourselves from evil desires. Through.

The Epistle.

Num. xx. 6—13. (The second striking of the Rock.)

The Gospel.

S. John iv. 5—42. (The woman of Samaria.)

SATURDAY.

Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty GOD, that they who, by afflicting their body, abstain from food, through the following after righteousness, may in like manner also fast from sin. Through.

The Epistle.

The Story of Susanna.

The Gospel.

S. John viii. 1—11.

These are in general the same as the Roman. If it be thought that the Collects differ in words rather than in ideas, and that the Sunday *Oratio* might have done as well for the whole week, still it is a pity to lose all these Lent lections, so happily chosen in themselves, and so admirably knitted together. We are bound, by the way, to observe on the great convenience of the Scriptural references given in the present edition to verses as well as to chapters of our own version, in addition to the vague 'Cap. iv. A.' and the like, of the original books.

We need not go through the rest of Lent, because the Sarum, Roman, and Anglican Epistles agree; we will rather turn to another subject.

We said, at the commencement of this article, that, in one particular, we had a serious complaint to bring against our editor, and we now proceed to state it. It refers to the arrangement of the sequences; we mean the Notkerian sequences, of which species are the vast majority of those contained in the Sarum books.

First, let us lay down a few general rules.

(1) A Notkerian sequence contains an indefinite number of prose stanzas, or *troparia*.

(2) These *troparia* run, usually speaking, in couplets, sometimes in triplets, and answer to each other: *a.* in the number of syllables; *β.* to a certain degree, in accent; *γ.* very frequently in rhyme, or assonance.

(3) Each *troparion* is divided into a certain number of *commatisms*, answering to the *commatisms* of the responsive *troparia*.

Thus, in—

A. 1 Prophetas tu inspirasti 2 ut præconia Christi 3 præcinnissent inclyta.

B. 1 Apostolos confortasti 2 uti tropæum Christi 3 per totum mundum verherent.

A and B are responsive *troparia*; 1, 2, and 3, are the *commatisms*, also mutually responsive, 1 to 1, 2 to 2, &c.

Now, the question has not yet been settled, in what way these commatisms should be represented to the eye.

It need hardly be said that, in the old books, they are not numbered at all. Of modern editors, Daniel takes no notice of them; nor does Mr. Neale; Mone breaks them up into short lines, thus:—

- 1 Prophetas tu inspirasti
ut præconia Christi
præcinuissent inclyta.
- 2 Apostolos confortasti
uti tropæum Christi
per totum mundum veherent.

But Mr. Neale endeavours to exhibit the mutually responsive troparia by marking them with the same italic letters; and our editor seems to have borrowed this practice from him; while, from Mone he has taken the separate lineation of each commatism.

Now, first of all; undoubtedly, in a collection of sequences, the editor has a right to give any metrical helps he thinks necessary; but, in editing a Missal, the matter stands on an entirely different footing. Here we want the exact reproduction of the matter which was sung according to the particular rite; not the editor's idea—let it be never so correct—of its arrangement. And this is especially the case with regard to commatisms, the division of which must always be matter, to a certain extent, of mere opinion.

And there are two other reasons why the practice is inconsistent with editorial duty.

1. Very few writers, even in mediæval times, understood the laws of these Proses. Over and over again, in the Sarum Missal, unmetrical words were, by mistake, inserted. The editor cannot alter them, for he is giving, not the best possible edition of the sequence, but the sequence as it stood in the best edition of the Sarum Missal; therefore he must actually divide wrongly, must parallelize what cannot be parallelized, if he adopts any metrical disposition of the text.

2. But several of these sequences were actually written by persons who believed that they had no rules. Even Clivotheus, in commenting on some of those which are most exact, says over and over again, 'Hujus prosæ solutus est contextus, nullâ-que rhythmî lege coercitus.' 'Hæc prosa solutam habet orationis compositionem, nec rhythmî legebus astringetur.' A curious example of a really prose sequence, composed by S. Mechtildis, is given by Mone. Some of the Sarum sequences are of this kind, and yet the editor has given them metrical divisions, as though they were capable of prosody.

Our first objection, then, to this arrangement is, that, in a classical edition of the Missal, it ought not to have found place at all.

But next, we must say that the actual arrangement is so very faulty, that we fear Hymnologists on the Continent, appreciating, as they must do, the immense labour and learning of the editor in other respects, will think their science at a very low ebb in England.

We will give an example: let it be the Sequence for S. John Evangelist. Thus it stands:—

- ' a. Johannes, Jesu Christo multum dilecte virgo,
- b. Tu, c. ejus amo-d.-re, carnalem
- b. In c. nave paren-d.-tem liquisti.
- e. Tu lene conjugis pectus respu-c.-isti, Messi-d.-am secutus.
- e. Ut ejus pectoris sacra meru-c.-isses fluen-d.-ta potare.
- f. Tuque g. in terra positus, gloriam conspexisti Filii Dei,
- f. Quæ so-g.-lum sanctis in vita creditur contuenda esse perenni.
- h. Te Christus in cruce triumphans matri suæ dedit custodem,
- h. Ut virgo virginem servares atque curam suppeditares.
- i. Tute carcere flagrisque fractus testimonio pro Christi d. es gavisus.
- i. Idem nomine venenum inque Jesu nomine venenum d. forte vincis.
- k. Ti-g.-bi summus tacitum cæteris Verbum suum Pater revelat.
- k. Tu g. nos omnes precibus sedulis apud Deum semper commenda,
- l. Johannes Jesu chare.'

Now, in the first place, a TROPARION CANNOT END IN THE MIDDLE OF A WORD, any more than could a line of a metrical hymn so end. The reason is manifest: because the cadence of the music *there* comes to a full stop. We need not say that to arrange a sequence with certainty (so far as the troparia are concerned) is IMPOSSIBLE, unless we have the music. Most assuredly the Editor here had the Gradual by his side; but had he taken it in connexion with this sequence, he *could* not have so disfigured the latter. Let us now endeavour to represent it as it ought to be printed; distinguishing the responsive troparia by responsive italics, and the commatiments by straight lines; and giving our reasons as we go on.

- { (a) Johannes, Jesu Christo
- { (a) Multum dilecte virgo.

Observe here how syllables and accentuations agree: also the final rhyme, Christo,—virgo.

- { (b) Tu ejus amore | carnalem in navi | parentem liquisti.
- { (b) Tu leve conjugis | respuisti pectus | Messiam secutus;
- { (b) Ut ejus pectoris | sacra meruisses | fluentia potare.

Notice first: that nave, not navi: *respuisti pectus*, not *pectus respuisti*, seem the better readings.

- We have then ; 1. A ternary system of troparia.
 2. Each troparion has three commatims.
 3. Each commatism has six syllables.
 4. The second commatism always rhymes to the third.

navi—liquisti.
 pectus—secutus.
 meruisses—potare.

And so, taking the second and third of the three first troparia,
 conjugis—pectoris.

We would ask the reader to compare the simplicity and completeness of this arrangement, with that of our editor.

{ (c) Tuque in terrâ positus | gloriam conspexisti | Filii Dei.
 { (c) Quæ solum sanctis in vitâ | creditur contuenda | esse perenni.

This does very well ; but there is another reading—"in *viâ* positus"—*via*, of course, being the grand old mediæval contrast between the journey *here*, and the PATRIA *there*. Therefore, very probably we should read

{ (c) Tuque positus in *viâ* | gloriam, &c.
 { (c) Quæ solum sanctis in *viâ* | creditur.

by means of which slight alteration the two commatims respond excellently well as to contrasted sense, and furthermore rhyme with each other.

{ (d) Te Christus in cruce triumphans | Matri suæ | dedit custodem
 { (d) Ut virgo Virginem servares | atque curam | suppeditares.

It will be observed, that *c* and *c*, and *d* and *d*, rhyme.

{ (e) Tute carcere flagrisque fractus testimonio | pro Christi es gavisus :
 { (e) Idem mortuos suscitâs, inque Jesu nomine | venenum forte vincis.

This is an example of responsory troparia where the division of commatims must be a matter of doubt. Read the former line, and you would make the first commatism end at *fractus* ; but then you come to the impotent conclusion of *inque* in the second. Read the second line, and you would pause at *suscitâs* ; but then you halt lamely at *flagrisque* in the first.

{ (f) Tibi summus | tacitum præ ceteris | Verbum suum Pater revelat :
 { (f) Tu nos omnes | sedulis precibus | apud Deum semper commenda.

This is the usual reading, but it will not do. The first and third commatims answer well enough ; but the second has, in *f* 1 seven syllables ; in *f* 2 only six.

The Sarum books have it, *tacitum ceteris*, with the sense :

'To thee the FATHER revealed That WORD, Who, in comparison 'with that which He told thee, was silent to others.' But we rather prefer the other reading, *tactum præ ceteris*: 'The WORD Which thou, beyond all others, didst touch:' thus referring to the Last Supper, and the Beloved Apostle's leaning on our LORD's breast; and also with allusion to his own words: 'quod vidimus, et manus nostræ tractaverunt de Verbo Vitæ.'

(a) Johannes, Christo care.

The sequence ends with a troparion which echoes the first; and thereby shows that *Johannes Jesu Christo multum dilecte Virgo* should be printed as we have printed it.

We may now, however, say a few words with respect to the general character of the Sarum Sequences.

It is a singular fact that, among all the European nations which received sequences as an institution, there are two, and only two, widely distinguished classes. The one introduced the Notkerian, the other the Metrical, proses. It is well known that the origin of sequences themselves is to be looked for in the Alleluia of the Gradual, sung between the Epistle and the Gospel. During this melody it was necessary that the deacon should have time to ascend from his place at the altar to the rood-loft, that he might thence sing the Gospel. Hence the prolongation of the last syllable in the Alleluia of the Gradual, in thirty, forty, fifty, or even a hundred notes; the service of which ritualistic writers speak so much. True, there was no sense in this last syllable and its lengthening out, but the mystical interpreters had their explanation: 'the way in which we praise God in our Country is yet unknown.'

And good people were content for some three hundred years with this service; and, as it has been very truly observed, the attempt itself, if one may use the expression, to explain the sound into sense, has a little of the rationalism with which the Eastern has always taunted the Western Church. But, towards the beginning of the eleventh century, there was a certain Swiss monk, by name Notker. The defects of every religious person were well known in the house where he resided; and a slight lisp in his speech gave him the surname of *Balbulus*. He had resided for some years in that marvellous monastery of S. Gall; the church of which was the pattern of all monastic edifices, till it was eclipsed by a church, the description of which now reads like a most glorious dream—Cluny. While watching the samphire-gatherers on the precipitous cliffs that surrounded S. Gall, Notker had composed the world-famous hymn, 'In the midst of life we are in death.' But, desirous of obtaining the best education which Christendom could afford, he afterwards

betook himself to the Monastery of Jumièges, and there formed an acquaintance with many of its monks. With one of them he had, it seems, a friendly discussion, whether the interminable *ia* of the Gradual might not be altered into a religious sense; a discussion which, for the time, had no result. But Jumièges, in common with so many other French monasteries, was desolated by the barbarian Normans. Whereupon Notker's friend, bethinking himself of S. Gall, took refuge in that great house; and the discussion which years before had commenced, was again carried on between the two associates. At length Notker determined to put words to the notes which had hitherto only interminably prolonged the Alleluia. He did so: and as a first attempt, produced a sequence which began with the line—

‘*Laudes Deo concinat orbis universus* :’

and which has lately been republished. He brought this, notes and all, on a parchment rolled round a cylinder of wood, to Yso, precentor of, what we should now call, the *Cantoris* side. Yso looked kindly on the composition, but said that he must refer it to Marcellus, the precentor on the *Decani* side. These two sang the sequence over together, and observed that sometimes two notes went to one syllable in a slur, sometimes three or four syllables went to one note in a kind of recitative. Yso, thereupon, was charged with the message that the verses would not answer their purpose. Notker, not much discouraged, revised his composition; and now, instead of (for the first line) *Laudes Deo concinat orbis universus*, he substituted *Laudes Deo concinat orbis ubique totus*: instead of the second line, *Coluber Adæ deceptor*, he now wrote, *Coluber Adæ male suasor*: which, as he himself tells us, when good-natured Yso had sung over to himself, he gave thanks to God, he commended the new compositions to the brethren of the monastery, and more especially to Othmar, Yso's brother by blood. Such then was the origin of sequences, at first called proses, because written rather in rhythmical prose than with any attention to metre.

The next stage was to make them strictly metrical, and with rhymes—usually speaking, double rhymes. This culminated in Adam of S. Victor, from whence such compositions have taken the name of Victorine. England and Scotland seem to have been the only countries where the earlier species was to the last the favourite.

The Sarum rite certainly does not stand high in its order of sequences. France takes the lead: her various offices possess some 200 of first-rate merit; and if we select the twelve Victorines which probably claim the first place, nine of them are of

French origin. It is singular that the unapproachable *Dies iræ*, and that which most persons (not however the present writer) would consider the second, *Stabat Mater*, should be Italian, as also another that claims a very high place, the *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*. The rest of the first twelve would probably be *Læta-bundus* (S. Bernard): *Heri mundus exultavit: Splendor Patris et figura: Zyma vetus expurgetur: Lux jucunda, lux insignis: Laudes crucis attollamus: Superna matris gaudia: all by Adam:—Mittit ad Virginem*, by Abælard:—*Verbum Dei, Deo natum*, by Henricus Pistor:—and *Potestate non naturæ* (author unknown).

The Sarum Missal has many of Adam's; indeed, almost all the Victorines it does contain are very good. But the majority of the Notherians, which appear chiefly of English manufacture, are very poor; such, for example, as *Nato canunt omnia*, for Christmas: *Resant sacrata*, for Whitsuntide: *Christi hodierna*, for Christmastide. Peculiarities are:—the use of sequences in Advent, which was contrary to the custom of nearly every other Church: the favourite *Alphaism*, by which so many proses not only end each troparia, but nearly every commatism, in *A*; and here and there allusions to the situation or circumstances of the Church of Salisbury; e.g. in a sequence on the Visitation:—

‘*Visitatrix in montanis,
Visitatrix in his planis,
Sis matris Ecclesie.*’

To the total sum of 2,000 known sequences, Sarum would yield about sixty peculiar to itself.

We might dwell on this subject at much greater length, but we will not spend any more time on the one blot of this noble book, though we could not have reconciled it to our conscience to omit all mention of it.

We will now glance at the various short versicles, &c. of the Sarum Missal, and their peculiarities. They are these:—

The *Ad Missam Officium* (Roman Introitus),
with the *Psalm*.

The *Oratio*.

The *Gradale* (Roman Graduale).

The *Offertorium*.

The *Secreta*.

The *Communio*.

The *Post Communio*.

The *Introit* of the Roman, the *Ad Missam Officium* of the Sarum books always agree, with these exceptions. They differ:—

On the 4th Sunday in Advent—where the Roman is *Rorate*

cæli desuper (Isaiah xlv. 8), the English *Memento nostro Domine* (Ps. cvi. 4, 5); Durandus only inserting the latter; but still, his words show that it was not universal: 'Clamat ad eam' ('sc. Divinitatem) introitus, dicens *secundum quasdam ecclesias*, 'Memento, &c.' The Southern Missals, generally speaking, agree with Rome: the Northern with us. Sicardus only gives *Memento*.

On Low Sunday, the Sarum Officium is *Resurrexi, et adhuc*, &c. as at Easter, but during the week *Quasimodo*, which the Roman Missal gives to the Sunday also.

With respect to the rest of the responses and anthems in the Sarum book, one thing is to be especially noticed: of all the leading Liturgies of different families, this came, by far, nearest to the Roman. More: this kept nearer to the Gregorian pattern than the Roman itself. And this is true, both of versicles which, when the spiritual sense was no longer understood, were replaced by an easier text; and also of readings which, because of a difficult word, were rejected by Rome; notwithstanding that difficult word, were retained by Salisbury. Let us take an example from the Breviary. Here, in the Epiphany Hymn, *A Patre Unigenitus*, which is A. B. C. Darian, the MSS. Breviaries read—

Quem jam venisse novimus,
Redire item cupimus,
Tu sceptrum tuum inclytum
Tuo defende clypeo.

So the verse came before the earliest Roman, and the earliest Sarum printers. Let us see how each treated it.

'Do Thou,' exclaimed the Roman corrector, 'defend Thy glorious sceptre with Thy shield?—what utter folly! There is something absolutely wrong here. What word will supply the requisite number of syllables?' And so, after a little floundering this way and that, the following was the result:—

Sceptroque tuo inclyto
Tuum defende populum.

'And with Thy glorious sceptre defend Thy people.' True: the *que* has no sense in it: true; *populum* has not a shadow of authority; but, still, the whole taken together yields some degree of sense.

The Sarum editor, on the other hand, retained the MS. reading, evidently without in the least understanding it; but believing that others could explain what he could not. And he was right; with the transposition of one little word—instead of

Tu sceptrum—

he should have given it

Sceptrum tu tuum inclytum
Tuo defende clypeo.

(And this because the line commencing with S must occupy its own place.)

Well, then, are we to understand that God's sceptre is to be defended by His shield? In no wise. But *sceptrum* is, more properly, *septrum*; from *sepio*: that is, *inclytum* *sceptrum* would tell us of the glorious fold of the Church, just as a hymn in the Aberdeen Breviary, on the Feast of S. Ninian reads 'Choris sceptus Angelicis.'

For once, we are about to follow the example of the Puritans, and to draw our 'use' from the subject of our article.

It has been the complaint of Liturgical Scholars, since the revival of Ecclesiological studies, that the English Clergy have been very backward in acquainting themselves with the offices on which their own were founded. It is too true an accusation. None can read the extraordinary 'views,' 'suggestions,' 'theories,' that fill up the '*Correspondence*' of most Church papers, without seeing that the writer was most profoundly and utterly ignorant of the very first principles of Liturgical study: some letters addressed to the *Church Review* are the *ne plus ultra* of this kind of thing. In a Church periodical now extinct, we remember that the study was pursued with more zeal than knowledge. In the *Theologian* appeared an article on the Sarum Liturgy, written by a gentleman who could not read black letter, and in which, among other and even more amusing blunders, occurred *disco operuit*, 'covered with a disk,' for *discooperuit*, 'uncovered.'

Up to the publication of this Missal, it was hard for the clergyman of the Church of England, who was not rich, to study the Sarum Liturgy: for what now can be bought for seven shillings, could only be obtained at the price of three or four pounds.

We can only add, and that in no irreverent spirit, 'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.' It must be remembered that not only by means of this republication, but also by the recent edition—however far inferior to this, of the Sarum Breviary—and by the reprint and *édition de luxe*, as our French neighbours would call it, of the Aberdeen—and then again, by the reprint and translation of the Primitive Liturgies, the way to these studies has been thrown open to our liturgical students to an extent which, fifty years ago, would have appeared fabulous. Supposing that then, at the commencement of this century, a young Clergyman, entering on a life dedicated to the Church, had been anxious to obtain—in the first place, the ser-

vices of the Primitive Church; next—which most nearly concerned him, the Services, both Liturgical and Choral, of his own Church, as it existed before the Reformation; we may safely affirm that he could not have procured the most necessary materials for this study under fifteen pounds. He may now buy them for as many shillings. This then we do feel most thankfully: that the physical impossibility, so to speak, of purchasing these books, can no longer be pleaded in excuse for the not being acquainted with their contents. Any man may now learn, if he will. And on this account, beyond all others, we desire to thank the editor of the latest edition of the Sarum Missal, for the invaluable gift he has bestowed on the English Communion. We have spoken out boldly where we think he is wrong; therefore we have the more right as boldly to say, that we know of no equal literary gift which has been bestowed on the Church, the chief Office-Book of which has here been re-edited, from the publication of the First Book of Edward VI. till the present time.

ART. VII.—*The Publications of the Surtees Society.* London, Durham, and Edinburgh.

AMONGST the many monuments of learning and literary labour of which our country has to boast, not the least notable are those works which have for their object the illustration of our national history and antiquities. Among our elder historians, Bede, Matthew Paris, and Polydore Vergil, claim the foremost place; Fox and Parker follow them in the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth and eighteenth (the great period of historical research in this country) the copious chronicles of Stow, Holingshed, and Hall, were followed by the ponderous folio of Speed, and, amongst other works of extent and importance, by Harpsfield's *Historia Anglicana*, Usher's *Antiquitates*, Sir R. Baker's *Chronicle*, Dugdale's *Monasticon*, Fuller's *Church History*, Alford's *Annales*, Burnet's *Reformation*, Stillingfleet's *Origines*, Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, and the *Histories of Inett, Collier, Strype, and Hume*.

The works of the same class which have been composed since the days of these giants in intellectual stature, are little other than mere compilations from their pages: insomuch that it might have been supposed that their work was completely done; the mine in which they laboured quite exhausted, and no material addition to our knowledge of long past events to be looked for.

Yet is the case far otherwise. It has hitherto been the fate of the historical student to sigh for the many original authorities which were either wholly beyond his reach, or were only to be consulted in some mutilated or otherwise untrustworthy form. Now, however, publications are from time to time issuing from the press which will eventually do very much, nearly all that can be done, to supply this want, introducing us to the original sources and fountain-heads of history; thus superseding all second-hand information, and giving in the end, it cannot be doubted, an entirely new character to historical study. The Camden Society has opened to our view many works illustrative of the history of the country at large, and the society whose name we have placed at the head of our pages is doing a like good office, though on a somewhat smaller scale, and within narrower limits. No man will henceforth be considered in any

wide sense of the word an historian who is not acquainted with the publications issued by these learned bodies; and assuredly no history of our country, whether on Church or State, can in future be written without frequent recourse to their pages. Rather the works in question are themselves, as far as they go, the true history, written as they were by those who were either actual eye-witnesses of the events they chronicle, or who lived so shortly afterwards that the memory of them was still fresh.

The Society, which derives its name from the late Robert Surtees, of Mainsforth, the learned antiquarian, and author of 'The History of the County Palatine of Durham,' was organized with the view of publishing, yearly, works, edited by members of the University of Durham, to illustrate the history, ecclesiastical and civil, of the part of England which formed the ancient kingdom of Northumbria. The chief subjects which have hitherto engaged the attention of these able and laborious scholars are rituals, histories, biographies, biblical translations, works descriptive of the daily lives and acts of the monks of Durham, and ecclesiastical and secular antiquities. Thus amply is redeemed the Society's pledge: 'It has been the endeavour of the Society as far as possible to diversify its publications, and to make them suitable to the tastes of many labourers in the wide field of literary research. The ritualist, the historian, and the genealogist have been equally considered.'

The value of all the works published by the Surtees Society is not perhaps equal; but some of them—such as the Pontificale of Egbert, Archbishop of York—hitherto known only in the brief and sparse extracts of a few writers on ecclesiastical subjects, or the three historians of Durham, Coldingham, Graystones, and Chambre, which were previously to be met with only in the inaccurate and mutilated edition of Wharton—are works at once of deep interest and real value, and as such their publication can be regarded as nothing less than a real national benefit, and our best thanks are due to those painstaking and public-spirited scholars, who have devoted time, labour, and means to this purpose. In the remarks we are about to offer on this very welcome addition to our shelves, we shall confine our notice chiefly to the ecclesiastical works, as being on the whole the most valuable portion of the series.

We must remind our readers that the kingdom of Northumbria was first converted by Paulinus, the companion of S. Augustin. Edwin, the king, had married Ethelburga, the daughter of Ethelbert and Bertha; and he was thus prepared by his wife and her family for the reception of Christianity. The good work accomplished by Paulinus was, however, soon to be undone. In the year 633, the sixth after his baptism,

King Edwin was killed in battle against Penda, King of Mercia. His two successors, Osrick and Eanfride, renounced the new faith; the people followed the example of their sovereigns in abjuring, as they had before done in adopting, Christianity, and compelled Paulinus, with the queen and family of Edwin, to take refuge in Kent. But two years or less subsequently, Osrick and Eanfride being in their turn defeated and slain, Oswald, the son of Edwin's predecessor, and the second founder of Christianity in the north of England, succeeded to the throne, and in a reign of seven years so firmly established the faith, that although subsequently persecuted and oppressed by the invading Danes, it was never wholly subverted. Oswald had spent the time of Edwin's reign, as Bede tells us, in exile 'among the Scots or Picts;' and consequently, when he succeeded that ill-fated monarch, instead of recalling Paulinus, or sending to Rome for missionaries, he applied to the Scots for a bishop, who sent him Gorman, a monk of Iona. But, not proving acceptable to the Northumbrians, Gorman soon returned to his native country, and was succeeded by Aidan, a monk of the same religious house. Pope Gregory had empowered Augustin to consecrate a metropolitan for York; but Oswald disregarded this arrangement, and gave Aidan for his see Lindisfarne, or Holy Island. Aidan soon received the assistance of a number of ordained monks; and in him began that succession of bishops of Holy Island, whose ordinary actions—omitting all mention of the miraculous achievements ascribed to them—approximate ecclesiastical history to romance. The reader of their lives is at a loss whether most to admire their extreme zeal, their apostolic simplicity, their fervent devotion, their profound contempt of wealth and worldly distinction, and their rare single-mindedness; or to wonder at their ignorance of enlarged principles, their semi-barbarism not only of manners but even of mind, and in some points what we must term their selfishness—a selfishness which was mistaken by themselves and their times for pure desire for the glory of God and the advancement of His work. This, both then and subsequently, was a common failing amongst ecclesiastics; yet it is not the less to be deplored and condemned, because it necessarily assumes the appearance of a high virtue. It is of the acts and literary productions of these men and their successors in the Palatinate that we shall chiefly treat.

To take the works of the Society, such of them, that is, as will especially engage our attention, in the order of their publication, would prove embarrassing at once to our readers and to ourselves. We shall prefer to regard rather their chronological order, or their mutual connexion, support, and illustration in

time or subject-matter. And first shall come the works that treat of the life and actions of that pride and wonder of the Anglo-Saxon Church, S. Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne.

There are many histories of this saint extant—Bede has left us two: one in verse and the other in prose, besides a copious account of his acts in his History. To the Surtees Society we are indebted for a prose life; another in Leonine verse published in the '*Miscellanea Biographica*,' and the collection of his miracles by Reginald of Durham. '*The Rites of Durham*,' a work written A.D. 1593, also describes his tomb, his book that fell into the sea when the monks of Lindisfarne were flying from the Danes, the state of his remains in the time of Henry VIII. and other particulars of his relics.

He has been supposed to have descended from the blood-royal of Ireland. This is expressed in the following lines of an Irish biographer, whose curious work is now in the British Museum. It is to be hoped, however, that the poet was better acquainted with the acts of the subject of his muse, than he shows himself to be with the rules of prosody.

'Sanctus Cuthbertus, Anglorum tutor apertus,
Regis erat natus et Hybernicus est generatus.'
Biog. Miscell. p. xi.

S. Cuthbert was successively Prior of Melrose, hostaller of the Monastery of Ripon, Prior of Lindisfarne, and Bishop of Hexam and Lindisfarne. After he had filled the latter see for two years, living in the practice of the most painful and laborious duties of a bishop, an anchorite, and an ascetic, and (if we may credit his historians) in the daily and almost hourly performance of miracles to us alternately astounding and ridiculous, he retired to his hermitage in the island of Farne, and there breathed his last. It was his original intention to be buried where he died; but at the earnest entreaties of those about him, he at length consented to be laid in the church of Lindisfarne. He imposed, however, on the monks the condition that in the event of their ever leaving that island they should take his remains with them. Accordingly they laid him in a stone coffin, on the right of the high altar at Lindisfarne Cathedral. Eleven years afterwards they obtained permission of his successor, Eadbert, to exhume his remains, intending to inclose them in a new coffin, and place them as an object of adoration above the pavement. But finding, as is related by Bede, not only that decay had not set in, but that his body was whole and the joints flexible as in life, they dressed it in new garments, and laid it in a coffin of oak which they placed upon the pavement of the church.

In the year 875, the Danes made a descent on the coast in great numbers; and now came the time to redeem the promise given to the saint at his death. The monks placed his body in a wooden coffin, and inclosed therein certain relics, among which were the skull of King Oswald and some bones of Aidan; and then set out on that course of wanderings which lasted for the space of seven years, and which is well known to the general reader, through Sir Walter Scott.

‘How, when the rude Dane burned their pile,
The monks fled forth from Holy Isle;
O’er northern mountain, marsh and moor,
From sea to sea, from shore to shore,
Seven years Saint Cuthbert’s corpse they bore.
They rested them in fair Melrose;
But though, alive, he loved it well,
Not there his reliques might repose;
For, wondrous tale to tell!
In his stone-coffin forth he rides,
(A ponderous bark for river tides)
Yet light as gossamer it glides
Downward to Tilmouth cell.
Nor long was his abiding there,
For southward did the saint repair;
Chester-le-Street and Rippon saw
His holy corpse, ere Wardilaw
Hail’d him with joy and fear;
And, after many wanderings past
He chose his lordly seat at last
Where his cathedral, huge and vast,
Looks down upon the Wear.
There, deep in Durham’s Gothic shade,
His reliques are in secret laid;
But none may know the place,
Save of his holiest servants three
Deep sworn to solemn secrecy
Who share that wondrous grace.’

Marmion, Canto ii. stanz. xiii.

His servants three must have forgotten their oath, as his dwelling-place has long been well known; but fortunately for their credit, the tradition rests on no basis of truth.

One of the earliest ideas of his bearers was to leave England entirely, and pass over to Ireland. With this view the Bishop Eardulph and a few more embarked on the Derwent, but were soon met by a violent storm which compelled them again to seek the land. It is recorded that in their haste and danger, one of their most valuable possessions, an elaborate and beautiful copy of the Gospels, written by Eadfrid, afterwards Bishop of Lindisfarne, for the use of S. Cuthbert, was washed overboard, and its loss formed one great inducement to them to return to land. The book, strange to say, was afterwards

discovered drifted on shore as far north and west as Withern, in Galloway. The place of its deposit is said to have been made known to the monks by S. Cuthbert himself, who appeared for that purpose to one of them in a dream. And as everything connected with S. Cuthbert must needs partake more or less of the miraculous, we learn from the historian Simeon, and from the compiler of the 'Rites of Durham,' 'that this holy booke 'was far more beautiful and glorious to looke upon both 'within and without than it was before, being nothing blemished 'with the salt water, but polished by some heavenly hand; which 'did not a little increase their joye.'¹

The book was subsequently conveyed to Durham, where Bishop Carileph (A.D. 1080—1099) placed it on the great altar 'as a fitt monument to preserve the memory of so great a 'saint.'²

When the above authors said that it was improved and beautified by its submersion, they had little idea that there would ever exist such an institution as the British Museum, or that this book would in subsequent times find a place in it, and thus afford a means of testing the truth of their assertion. Unfortunately for their veracity, the volume, which is actually in that repertory, bears evident traces of the damaging effects of the sea-water.

From the west coast the band of wanderers travelled to Craike, in Yorkshire, thence to Chester-le-Street, to Ripon, and lastly to Durham. It is related that soon after their arrival at Chester-le-Street, S. Cuthbert appeared to Eadred the abbot in a dream, and bid him tell King Alfred to give him all the land between the Wear and the Tyne, and to make his church a place of refuge for criminals of whatever kind for thirty-seven days. This was accordingly done, and thus the territory of S. Cuthbert was converted into a county palatine, and its bishops were made temporal princes. From Ripon it was the intention of S. Cuthbert's bearers to remove him either back to Chester-le-Street, or to his original resting-place in Lindisfarne, but they were prohibited from so doing by another miracle. When they came into the neighbourhood of Durham, the carriage on which the coffin was placed, suddenly became so firmly fixed to the ground as to defy the efforts of the whole band to move it. After three days spent in acts of extraordinary devotion, the saint was pleased to reveal to Eadmer, one of the monks, his intention to have his final rest nowhere but at Dunholme. But 'being distressed,' says the old historian, 'because they were 'ignorant where Dunholme was, see their good fortune, as they

¹ Rites of Durham, p. 60.² Ibid. p. 53.

'were goinge, a woman that lacked her cow did call aloud to her companion to know if shee did see her, who answered with a loud voice that her cow was at Dunholme, a happy and heavenly eccho to the distressed monkes, who by that meanes were at the end of their journey, where they should find a resting place for the body of their honoured saint. And thereupon, with great joy and gladnesse brought his body to Dunholme, Anno Domini 999, which was inculta tellus, a barbarous and rude place, replenished with nothing but thornes and thick woods, save only in the midst where the church now standeth, which was plaine and commodious for such a purpose.' (*Rites of Durham*, p. 61.) 'And because,' the author continues, 'those holy bishops and monkes would not be unmindful of the least favour which was done for them, and the honour of their holy saint; Aldinus, on the outside of his church, and Ranulph Flamberd, according to the intention of William Carlipho, the founder, did erect a monument, of a MILKE-MAIDE MILKING HER KOWE, on the outside of the north-west turrett of the nine altars, at the buildinge of the new church, in a thankful remembrance of that maide which so fortunately in their great perplexity directed them to Dunholme, where the body of their great saint was to rest untill the resurrection, which monument, though defaced by the weather, to this day is there to be seen.' (P. 63.)

An ancient sculpture of two women and a cow was, in fact, in existence at the beginning of the present century on the eastern transept; but it has since been replaced by a modern substitute. After three several buildings had been erected, in which to deposit the remains of the saint, Bishop Carileph, in the beginning of the eleventh century, laid the foundation of the present cathedral, and in the Episcopate of Flambard, his successor, Cuthbert's remains were removed to the spot which they occupied till the Reformation, and over which they are still deposited.

Soon after (A.D. 1022) a miracle, as Reginald calls it, or, as it would more probably be termed in these days, a systematic fraud, was openly and habitually performed by a relic-hunter of the name of Elfrid Westone. Under pretence of great reverence for S. Cuthbert, he was accustomed to open his coffin, and comb and cut what he called his hair, which he would publicly expose to the action of fire: the opinion of the bystanders of the merits of the saint being, of course, much increased when it was seen to shine in the flames like gold without suffering injury or diminution.

The conjecture of Dr. Raine, the learned historian of North Durham, that this pretended hair was nothing else than a portion

of gold wire which Reginald states to have been bound round the skull, and the impress of which remained distinctly visible thereon when the coffin was opened in the year 1827, seems as probable as it is simple and obvious. Be this as it may, the hair of S. Cuthbert was not the first to which the reputation of incorruptibility had been attached. The '*Biographia Miscellanea*' contains, among other things, a life of Oswin, an early king of Deira, who was treacherously put to death by Oswy, the usurper of his crown. The author appears to have been a monk of S. Albans, who had removed to Tynemouth, a dependent cell of the monastery of the proto-martyr; and he informs us, that 414 years after the death of Oswin, in the time of Tosti the brother of Harold, the body of the murdered sovereign was discovered and exhumed. The hair was found undecayed, and Judith, the wife of Tosti, to confirm the people's faith in the sanctity of Oswin, publicly tested it by fire, and found that it was inconsumable.¹

But in the year 1072, a deception more flagrant in itself, and which might have proved of more important consequences, was practised by the clergy of Durham to preserve undetected the false fame of the incorruptibility of the remains of S. Cuthbert. William the Conqueror heard the report of the incorruptible body that was at Durham; and wishing to ascertain its truth, resolved to have the coffin opened, and the contents inspected by two of his chaplains. The feast of All Saints was the day appointed for the exhumation, and the service was commenced, when the king was suddenly seized by a violent fever, under the influence of which he rushed from the church, mounted his horse, and rode without stopping until he had crossed the Tees. It seems clear that the clergy knew that the proposed inspection must instantly prove the falsehood of the pretended miracle, and as William had threatened them with death, if they were discovered to be guilty of a fraud, the idea of Dr. Raine, that they had practised on him, as the unknown monk is said to have done on his descendant John, to produce his illness, seems but too probable. The degradation of these unworthy priests was, however, at hand. In the year 1083, Bishop Carileph expelled the secular clergy for their sloth and evil habits, and instituted in their place a prior and monks of the order of S. Benedict, from the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow.

Twenty-one years afterwards, on the 29th of August, the coffin was opened, and the body inspected by the prior and a few of the brethren of the monastery, previously to its removal

¹ *Biog. Miscell.* p. 14.

to its final resting-place behind the high altar of the new cathedral. Reginald has minutely described the appearance of the coffin, the body, the robes in which it was enveloped, and, in a word, every particular connected with it. The body was wrapped in the winding-sheet given to the saint during his life by the Abbess Vecca, over which was the alb, stole, and fanon; an amice was on the neck and shoulders, above them a purple dalmatic and tunic; then robes of silk, and lastly, the episcopal sandals were on his feet. The coffins were three in number. The innermost was that in which he had been placed in Lindisfarne: it was covered with most elaborate carvings of flowers, beasts, and other objects, and the lid was raised by two iron rings, one at the head, and another at the feet. It is significant that the head and face were covered by a cloth which could not be raised, and which merely allowed a view of the eyelids and part of the nose; but there was a purple face-cloth, which, when raised, gave sight of the person between the joints of the neck and shoulders. On the forehead was a fillet of gold studded with gems. In the coffin lay the scissors and comb already mentioned as having been used by Westone: a small silver altar, a cloth for covering the sacramental elements, and a golden paten. The head of Oswald, and some other relics, reposed by his side. The body was found to be so flexible, that three persons were required to lift it out of the coffin, one at each extremity, and one in the middle.

But a certain abbot not being quite satisfied as to the truth of the incorruptibility of the body, it was agreed, after some discussion, to give him ocular proof of the fact, which was done in the following manner. The body was brought into the choir, where the coffin was opened, and another person, the Abbot of Seez, who had espoused the part of the prior and his monks, was commissioned to handle the remains: no one else being allowed by the prior to touch them, or anything belonging to them. This was, of course, decisive; the wonder of the devout believers was satisfied, and the doubts of the sceptical were silenced, if not removed. The revered remains with the head of S. Oswald were now again consigned to the coffin, which, as Reginald signifies, was raised on nine stone pillars, and placed behind the high altar, where it was allowed to remain undisturbed and in peace to the time of Henry VIII. In the year 1540-41, three commissioners, as we learn from the Rites, 'Dr. Ley (or Lee), Dr. Henley, and Maister Blythman,' held a visitation at Durham, 'for the subverting of monuments, . . . where they found many worthy and precious jewels, but especially one precious stone, which, by the estimate of those three visitors and their skilful lapidaries, was of value sufficient

‘to redeem a prince. After the spoil of his ornaments and ‘jewels, coming nearer to his body, thinking to have found ‘nothing but dust and bones, and finding the chest that he did ‘lie in very strongly bound with iron, then the goldsmith did ‘take a great fore-hammer of a smith, and did break the said ‘chest; and when they had opened the chest, they found him ‘lying whole, uncorrupt, with his face bare, and his beard as it ‘had been a fortnight’s growth, and all his vestments upon him, ‘as he was accustomed to say mass withal, and his mete-wand of ‘gold lying beside him.’¹

The account states further, that the goldsmith, on opening the coffin, broke one of his legs, an accident which seems to have led to a closer examination of the body, the result being, that not only was it found to be ‘whole and uncorrupted, but ‘the vestments wherein his body lay, and wherewithal he was ‘accustomed to say mass, were safe, fresh, and not consumed. ‘Whereupon the visitors commanded that he should be carried ‘into the vestry, where he was close and safely kept in the ‘inner part of the revestire till such time as they did know the ‘king’s pleasure what to do with him; and upon notice of the ‘king’s pleasure therein, the prior and the monks buried him ‘in the ground under the same place where his shrine was ‘exalted.’ (Pp. 85, 86.)

These assertions have been tested within our own times. In the year 1827, the tomb was again opened, and its contents a fourth time inspected. A full account is given by Dr. Raine, who was one of those engaged in the work. Everything was found precisely as Reginald had described it. There were three coffins, all very much decayed. The innermost, that in which the remains had originally been deposited at Lindisfarne in the year 698, contained among other things, the skull, real or pretended, of King Oswald; an iron ring, one of the two, doubtless, which had been used for the purpose of raising the lid, the ivory comb, the small silver altar, and the linen bag to contain the sacramental elements. This coffin was found to be covered with carved work precisely as described by Reginald. But whilst this examination established the veracity of that historian, it completely disproved the tradition of the incorruptibility of the saint’s remains. Not only was nothing but bones found, but the condition of the coffin in which they lay showed clearly no decay of flesh, or exuding of blood or other fluid had taken place since the remains were first deposited in it. Dr. Raine suggests that the body had been swathed in clothes to resemble in bulk and pliability a living form; and what is most remark-

¹ Rites, p. 85.

able, the eyeholes of the skull were ascertained to have been filled by a white paste, no doubt to give to the face-cloth, as the above able antiquary supposes, the projecting appearance of eyes; a fact which alone would tend to prove that deceit had been practised at some time, most probably in the year 1104.

The miraculous power of S. Cuthbert was by no means confined to the merely passive achievement of preserving his remains from decay. The battle of Neville's Cross showed him in the higher light of the national champion and protector. David, King of Scotland, taking advantage of the absence of Edward III. in France, invaded the north of England with an army of 50,000 men, and advanced as far as the gates of Durham. The regular army of England was with Edward, and there was little to oppose the enemy but scanty levies hastily raised and very imperfectly disciplined. In these critical circumstances, John Fossom, Prior of Durham, was commanded by the saint, in a vision on the night before the battle, to put the corporax cloth which Cuthbert had used to cover the elements at mass on a spear, and repair with it to the field of battle. He did so; and such was the sanctity of the holy relic, that it overcame the virtue even of the miraculous Black Rood of Scotland, and insured the victory to the English. A saint who could so effectually protect the nation was, of course, the most fit person to be made guardian of cities and churches, and S. Cuthbert was accordingly the patron saint of Lindisfarne, Hexam, Chester-le-Street, Durham, and several other places; and his figure, with the head of King Oswald in the left hand, formed the seal of several of the bishops of the see. Bishop Kirkham even went so far as to invoke him as giver of grace and salvation, in a Latin line couched in terms which could rightly be addressed to the Creator alone:

‘Presul Cuthberte regnem super æthera per te:’

and William Stiphel, Sub-Prior of Durham, has left an illumination in which he is represented in the attitude of supplication before S. Cuthbert, to whom he is addressing a prayer not less offensive:

‘Confessor vere Cuthberte mei miserere.’

The work which gives us these, contains many other like rhymes, but we gladly spare our readers the pain of perusing them. It cannot be wondered at, that as soon as a sound knowledge began to be diffused through the country, the system which allowed so grave an offence against the primary truth of Revelation should at once have been swept away. The virtues and graces of the saints should have been the examples of their

successors; but they were made by the mere perverseness of the latter to be the means of obscuring the truth; so that it was scarcely possible to avoid applying to them the emphatic words of the Psalmist, 'The things that should have been for their wealth, are made unto them an occasion of falling.'

The miracles, so called, that have been ascribed to S. Cuthbert are almost without number. To give even a bare enumeration of them would be impossible; but some related by Reginald are so grotesque that we cannot forbear offering one or two as a specimen of the rest. There are, on the island of Farne, a race of ducks called eider or S. Cuthbert's ducks, which the saint took under his especial protection, appropriating to them a spot on the island on which to build their nests, and appointing them their seasons of arrival and departure. The progeny shared the privileges of the parents. For after S. Cuthbert's death, an eremite, by name Ælric, made his habitation on the island, accompanied by his servant Leving. Ælric was called away by some emergency, but he left his servant behind him. The man, feeling a strong inclination to try the savouriness of one of the ducks, forthwith selected and killed the best and fattest he could find. To prevent his sin against the saint being found out, he scattered the bones and feathers up and down the shore. A fortnight after, his master returned; and lo, in the church of S. Cuthbert, below the host, collected together in a mass, lay the feathers, beak, bones, and claws, of the slaughtered bird. He examined Leving as to whether any stranger had visited the island, and being assured that no one had touched the shore since his departure, he at once taxed the luckless culprit with the double sin of having broken the command of S. Cuthbert and eaten a duck! The man at first denied it, but being shown the remains, he fell conscience-stricken at his master's feet, and made a full confession of his crime; expressing his wonder how the parts which he had taken so much pains to scatter had been collected together, and why, after so long a time, the sea had given them up unconsumed. But the sea, exclaims the author, presumed not to swallow the remains of the saint's bird, the flesh of which this sinner had scrupled not to devour! It cannot be doubted, he adds, that it was S. Cuthbert's powerful hand which had collected the fragments and cast them into his church, at once to discover the presumption of the culprit and to reveal his wickedness. The hermit gave S. Cuthbert his acknowledgments, and to satisfy him, visited the shoulders of his servant with a good flagellation, and condemned him to pass many days in abstinence and repentance. Reginald appeals for the truth of this miracle to Leving, who

was still alive when he penned his work, and who had often described the fact to himself and others. Ælric also during his life had been accustomed to talk of it.¹ It did not occur to them that on so bare a spot as Farne, the gusts and eddies of wind may have had a good deal to do with the matter, sweeping together the heavier portions of the bird, and depositing them (as one sees masses of sea-weed deposited at the foot of a rock) in some sheltered place where they could drift no further.

Again, the bearers of S. Cuthbert's body had been pursuing their heavy occupation for a long period, and had got very weary of it, and began to complain to each other of the length of the way and the burthen of their task. One after another of the band dropped off, until four only were left. To one of these S. Cuthbert appeared in a vision, and bade him tell his companions to go on the morrow each of them into a wood, and appropriate whatever they should find there to the work of carrying his remains. They went, and found among them a bit, a horse, a bridle, and a carriage loaded with every kind of necessary for their journey. They placed the body on the carriage, and so carried it about without fatigue to themselves. But a more astounding proof of S. Cuthbert's power was to happen. There was a famine in the land caused by the ravages of the Dane; and our wanderers had nothing to eat but salt horse's head and cheese. One of the number, unable to endure the pangs of famine, stole some of the cheese. The others fell to imploring the aid of S. Cuthbert, and begged that the thief might be turned into a fox. Now came the wonder. As they sat at their frugal meal, with the ground for their table, they suddenly beheld a fox running about S. Cuthbert's coffin with some new cheese in his mouth. Although it was judged becoming by them to offer this prayer, it seems that the last thing they dreamt of was, that the saint would take them at their word; and in consequence they were filled with amazement at what they saw, and wondered what could be the meaning of so novel and wonderful a portent. At first they thought that none of their number were missing, but it turned out that one, by name Eilaf, was nowhere to be seen. Meanwhile, the fox kept running round and round the coffin with its mouth open, but the cheese held in some wonderful manner in its jaws, and by the grotesqueness of its movements greatly exciting their mirth; it being unable either to swallow the cheese or to conceal it, whilst its new form ('vellus insoliti corporis') prevented the possibility of its escaping notice. At length the bearers put it to one another that the thief had been

¹ Reginald, chap. xxvii. pp. 60-63.

sufficiently punished, the power of S. Cuthbert proved, and their own waning faith confirmed, and that they ought all to unite in praying the saint to restore the culprit to his proper shape. S. Cuthbert gave a gracious ear to their petitions, and Eilaf again stood before them a man; a proof at once of the saint's anger against sinners, and of his clemency towards his faithful bedesmen. But something was required to perpetuate the memory at once of so great a crime and so wonderful an act of power; and consequently the name of Tod or Fox was given to the poor culprit; and, says Reginald, it has stuck to his descendants to this very day.¹

On one occasion, S. Cuthbert, proved by the unanswerable test of a candle dedicated to him burning out the first, that his merits and power were greater than those of his rivals King Edmund the Martyr, and Queen Eldritha. On another, the crew of a fishing smack were employing themselves as they sailed with fishing, when suddenly a violent storm arose; their mast went by the board; their steering tackle was lost; their oars were broken or rendered useless: the crew were nearly dead with fear—all hope of life seemed gone, and they spoke only to implore the aid of S. Cuthbert. But lo! the saint himself suddenly, as in a bodily form, visibly and palpably appeared before them, and took on himself the office of their pilot. He was arrayed in his pontifical garments, with his mitre on his head. His appearance was that of beauty, such as eye had never before beheld. With his pontifical staff, as with a rudder, he divided the raging waters, and caused the ship to scud on the top of the waves, so that they had no power over her to injure or turn her from her course. S. Cuthbert bade them be of good cheer, and promised not to leave them until he had brought them safe to shore. They soon after landed on Lindisfarne, S. Cuthbert driving the ship high and dry on the sands, so that the crew in disembarking did not even wet their shoes. He then caused them to disembark all their lading, tackle, nets, and fish, and to secure the battered hull by cables, that the waves might not carry it out to sea. This done, he simply said, '*Consummatum est*,' and, vanishing from their sight, returned again to his place of rest and beatitude. The sailors told all that had happened to Bartholomew, a monk of Durham, who was leading the life of a hermit on the island, and from whose relation to John the Monk, Reginald affirms himself to have received the story. He does not fail, in conclusion, to compare this miracle of S. Cuthbert to that of our Lord, when He came to His disciples as they were toiling in rowing, and brought them at once to land (S. John vi. 21). We

¹ Reginald, chap. xv.

cannot help noticing the fact that, with an error hardly to the credit of a divine and a historian, he strangely supposes this event to have happened after the Resurrection.

So much for Reginald of Durham. Bede, in his life of S. Cuthbert, has many stories even more wonderful. He relates how one morning, when S. Cuthbert had come out of the sea, where it was his custom to spend the night in prayer up to the neck in water, two otters followed him on shore, and lay down before him, and wiped his feet with their hair; after which, he gave them his blessing, and they returned to their native element (chap. x.). Again, as he was travelling on an evangelical mission, he and a boy, his attendant, having no provisions of their own, were miraculously fed by an eagle, which caught a fish just as they were passing, and brought it to land for their express benefit (chap. xii.).

Soon after is recorded a marvel which must surely have been in the mind of the witty and facetious author of the 'Ingoldsby Legends' when he wrote his inimitable 'Jackdaw of Rheims.' S. Cuthbert had built some huts for the use of the brethren of his monastery, and he one day saw two crows, which had been accustomed to build on the island, pulling out the thatch for their nests. He stretched out his hand, and warned them to do no harm to the brethren. Seeing that they paid no attention to his words, he adjured them in the Name of our Lord immediately to leave the place and return no more. On this, they at once fled sorrowfully away. Three days after, as S. Cuthbert was digging, one of them returned, and with outspread wings, head bent down to the saint's feet, and humble voice, asked pardon for what it had done by the most expressive signs it could make. Its prayer was granted, and S. Cuthbert also gave it leave to return to the island. The culprits hereupon exhibited an anxiety to atone for their misdeeds, which surpassed that even of the Bird of Rheims itself. Not contented with simply expressing penitence, and resolved to make more ample amends than the mere restitution of the stolen thatch would have been, they fled back to the saint with a large piece of hog's lard. S. Cuthbert accepted their tribute, and kept the lard for greasing the brethren's shoes; and he used, whenever he produced it, to bid them imitate the example of the givers, who, when they had done what was wrong, hastened by prayers, lamentations, and gifts to wash away their offence. The crows remained many years on the island, a pattern to all men of reformation; and they never attempted from that day forth to do mischief to any one! (chap. xx.)

The supernatural stories related by Bede of S. Cuthbert resemble in one respect those contained in the Ecclesiastical and

Religious History of Theodoret. Both sets of miracles are wholly incredible in themselves; yet their respective narrators declare them to be true, either on personal knowledge or on the assurance of those who saw them done, or who had other infallible means of knowing their truth. Many of these wonderful achievements can of course be immediately explained by the laws of nature; but there are still many to which this solution cannot apply; and what are we to say of these? Were their authors the mere victims of excessive and blind credulity, or were they wilfully deceiving? One or other of these conclusions appears to be inevitable, and yet there are grave objections to both. The question is one, in fact, on which much has been written; but a satisfactory answer seems as far off as ever. We think that none can be given; consequently, all we can do is to leave the matter where we find it. And, when we consider that even in these days, when so much more is known of the phenomena of Nature, we still meet with persons, sensible and well informed in other respects, who are ready to believe almost anything partaking of the marvellous and supernatural, it does not seem so astonishing that in times when so little was known, people, whose minds were full of one subject, and who were necessarily the victims in so great a degree of their own senses, should have thought much that was really very ordinary and matter of course to be beyond the laws of Nature. It shows perhaps that they who so concluded were beginning to observe more closely the arcana of Nature. The wonder rather is, that the historians of such stories—Reginald and others—did not use their reason a little, the slightest exercise of which would at once have sufficed, as in the monk turned into a fox, to explain the whole mystery. At the same time, we confess that there are still some miracles, such as that of S. Cuthbert bringing the ship into port, which do not admit of such explanation. But we must remember that this, like other similar stories, rests on the testimony of those who had an interest in inventing such reports, and who are the prototypes of our modern seafaring men, whose superstitions and wonderful stories of supernatural events, devoutly believed in by them, are well known to all who have the least acquaintance with their class. Yet, excuse and explain it as we may, the belief in these stories in the ages when they were written by Bede and Reginald is, as the editor of Reginald justly remarks, 'a fact humiliating enough to human reason.'

But we should greatly err, and do our subject much injustice, if we took our idea of S. Cuthbert wholly from this farrago of profane nonsense. Bede, when ceasing to speak of him as a worker of miracles, and telling us what he was as a prior and bishop, gives us a glimpse of better things. He describes him

as really doing the work of an evangelist, and labouring to convert the people from witchcraft, idolatry, and vice; and says, it was his custom to go either on horseback or on foot, but more frequently the latter, to the towns in the neighbourhood of his monastery, and preach to and teach the people. For this purpose, he frequently preferred the villages that were seated on the mountains, the poverty and barbarity of which caused them to be deserted by other missionaries. He would often spend weeks at a time teaching the people at once by his precept and example. He further describes him as a man of rare zeal and devotion; fervid in correcting sinners, but gentle and mild to the penitent.¹ And if, among his personal habits, we find it boasted, as a proof of his renunciation of self and of his almost superhuman virtue, that (among other like actions) he would frequently keep his shoes on from one Easter to another, and only then removed them because of the washing of the feet that preceded the celebration of the Lord's Supper, we must remember the light in which such conduct appeared to the men of his own age and long subsequent ones; who, so far from ascribing to cleanliness the place allotted to it in our modern proverb, considered even a moderate attention to its dictates as betokening a mind given up to luxury, and intent only on the pleasant things of life. But S. Cuthbert was, upon the whole, in advance of his time in this respect. Bartholomew the hermit, who lived on the island after S. Cuthbert, carried his dislike of water to a far greater extent than did that saint. Bede tells us, that S. Cuthbert used to wear ordinary garments, and was remarkable neither for their too great neatness, nor for their want of cleanliness. In his convent the monks followed his example, and only made it their custom not to have their clothing of any varied or precious colour.²

S. Cuthbert's reputation, however, thus prepared and bolstered up with wonders and miracles, far surpassed that of men who were better than himself; at least, who did much greater service to the Church and the kingdom in their day; such as Bede, S. John of Beverley, and others. We will borrow a passage from Dr. Raine's '*North Durham*,' which, to our mind, accounts for this fact:

'Such was the credulity of the period which set in soon after the death of Cuthbert, that a saint had become necessary for the welfare of the church of Lindisfarne, and Cuthbert was the only one of its Bishops who could be pitched upon with any degree of propriety. Aidan, its first Bishop, had held erroneous notions with respect to the observance of Easter. Finan was still more heterodox, and Colman so far defended the customs of his predecessors as to

¹ Eccles. Hist. book iv. chap. 27.

² Bede's Life of S. Cuthbert, p. 18.

resign his charge, from the most conscientious motives. Tuda, the next Bishop, died before he had an opportunity of enriching a future legend, and any miracle which might have been performed by Eata, his successor, would have been equally claimed by the see of Hexham. Cuthbert, therefore, was the first Bishop of Lindisfarne of whom a patron saint could be fairly made. Upon the important points of Easter and ecclesiastical tonsure he was orthodox, and besides, what I verily believe to be the case, he was eminently remarkable for his simplicity of manners and his judicious deportment.—P. 62.

Whatever graces of mind or disposition S. Cuthbert may have possessed, it is certain that to those of the person he could have laid little or no claim. There is a description of him, in which he is said to have had a long face, and to have been of a variedly ruddy complexion (*facie aliquantulum producta interfuse subrubicundus*), with the hair of his head and beard rather thin, and sprinkled with grey: but as this only depends on the testimony of a poor insane youth, to whom he appeared in a vision 600 years after his death, and is in part opposed to the evidence of his remains, the skull showing that his face must have been a short one, we would rather not lay much stress on it.¹ Reginald tells us, he was tall and of manly stature, but with a sharply turned-up nose, and a furrow in his chin, so deep as almost to contain a man's finger. The examination of his remains by Dr. Raine enables us to add, that he had a flat, narrow forehead and parietal bones, protuberant occipital bones, a short face, eyes deeply set in the head, high cheek-bones, a remarkably protuberant upper jaw, and a large and projecting front tooth. We must leave to phrenologists to decide from these data as to what were the saint's moral and intellectual powers and endowments: if we do not mistake, they would say that he had probably a considerable capacity for concentrating his powers on one object, but, judging from the flat parietal bones, no very strong natural bias towards religion, and none of the higher intellectual gifts; but that his most distinguished characteristics were, a good deal of caution, prudence, and what is termed longheadedness. And, as if to confirm this view, it is certain we have no mention of any works of his, theological or other, such as those of Bede, in the same century; and in his evangelical labours, with a people as ignorant as those among whom he visited, a very little learning would go a great way, and enable him, with the example of a life which there is no doubt was one of remarkable holiness, to produce great results in his own day, and to leave a high reputation behind him.

The 'Rites of Durham' gives us an interesting account of some portions of the daily life and customs of the monks of

¹ Reginald of Durham, chap. cxiv.

Durham. The prior, or lord prior, as he was more properly called, was the head of the house, whose name and office at the suppression of the monasteries were merged into those of the dean; Hugh Whitehead having been the last prior and the first dean. It was his duty to see that hospitality was preserved in the convent; and we read, that the prior 'did keep
' a most honourable house and very noble intertayment, being
' attended upon both with gentlemen and yeomen of the best
' of the countrie, as the honourable service of his house deserved
' no lesse; the benevolence thereof, with the releef and almesse
' of the hole convent was alwaies oppen and free, not onlie to
' the poore of the citie of Durham, but to all the poore people
' of the countrie besides.' In accordance with this character, a number of poor children, called children of the almshouse, were taught in the almshouse school, which was founded and maintained by the priors, and were fed from the table of the novices. Four aged women were also lodged in the almshouse without the south gates, supported by the prior, and fed from his own table. In addition to the above school, there was one for the express purpose of teaching six children to sing. They were fed with the children of the almshouse school at the cost of the house. The master was lodged near the school, and bachelors (as we should say) in the prior's hall, with the prior's gentlemen, but in all other respects he was supported jointly by the prior and convent. It was his duty to play the organ at high mass, and at even-song. This school was continued till the suppression of the monastery, when it was abandoned, and the building, falling into decay, was pulled down. For more notable and extensive entertainments, the convent possessed 'a famous house of hospitallitie,' called the guests' hall, furnished with chambers for the reception of strangers, of whatever rank or degree. Their provisions were supplied from the prior's kitchen, and were in quality according to the quality of the guests; and yearly, on Maunday Thursday, the prior washed and kissed the feet of thirteen poor men, and gave each of them thirty pence in money, and seven herrings, serving them himself with drink and three loaves of bread, and 'certaine wafers': the monks performed the same service at the same time to 'certaine' (probably the same number of) children. 'The godly ceremony thus endyd, after certaine praiers said by the prior and the whole convent, they did all depart in great holiness.'

The chief officer under the prior was the sub-prior, who had control of all the monks and novices. He always dined and supped with the monks, saying grace, and presiding at the high end of the table. He visited the dorter, or dormitory, every

night about midnight, and knocked at the chamber-door of each of the monks, and called on the inmates by name, to ascertain that all were in their rooms and quiet. His own room was the first in the dortor, so situated that he might see to the preservation of order among the brethren. The doors of the frater-house, cellar and cloisters, were locked every evening at five o'clock, and the keys were taken to the sub-prior till seven the next morning, when he caused the doors to be opened, and delivered the keys of the cloister to the porter, and those of the frater-house and cellar to the yeoman of the cellar.

The monks and novices slept each in his own chamber, which was wainscoted, and partitioned off from the dortor, or dormitory. This is described as a faire large house, 'all paved with fyne tyled stone from one end to the other.' The windows of these chambers looked towards the cloister eastward, and towards the infirmary westward, and in each stood a desk for their books. At each end of the dortor were twelve cressets of stone, which were kept burning all night, to light the monks and novices when they rose for the midnight lauds and matins, and other purposes. It was the duty of the cook to see that these cressets were properly supplied with grease. The chambers of the novices were less comfortable than those of the monks. They had merely such light as penetrated from the 'foreside,' being close both above and on either side.

The frater-house was a large hall, finely wainscoted on the north, south, and west sides. At eleven o'clock, the bell rang to summon them to wash at the laver, or conduit, after which, they proceeded to the 'loft,' which was in the west end of the frater-house, where they dined. In another loft over the frater-house, as appears, the elder monks dined, and the whole convent, with the sub-prior, supped. After dinner, the younger monks were accustomed to resort to the sanctory garth, or burial-place of the convent, each standing bare-headed for a certain long space, and praying for the souls of those who lay beneath. Their devotions ended, they went back to their studies until evening at three o'clock. The older monks, however, and the novices were exempt from this discipline. At five o'clock, the supper of the convent, at which the sub-prior again presided, was concluded, when the monks went to the chapter-house, where, with the prior, they remained in devotion till six; at which time, upon the ringing of a bell, they went to the Salvi.

As in our colleges, there was attached to the convent a common room, in which, in winter, a fire was kept burning, for the benefit of the monks; the master and officers of the house

alone being allowed fires in their own rooms. In this room was held, between Martinmas and Christmas, the festival of O Sapientia: a solemn banquet of 'figs, reysings, aile and 'kakes, kept with no superfluitie or excesse, but a scholastical 'and moderate congratulacion amonges themselves.' Near this room was an underground one of a very different nature, and dedicated to a very different purpose—the 'stronge prysone, 'called the lynghe-house, in which great offenders among the 'monks, *e. g.* those taken in felony or adultery, were confined 'in chaines, and deprived for a year of all society, but that of 'the master of the fermory, who let down their meat through 'a trap-door with a cord.' The lay members of the house offending in the same manner were delivered over to the secular power.

When a monk was taken ill he was removed from his own chamber in the dortor to one in the infirmary, 'where he might have both fire and more convenient keeping.' If he seemed not likely to recover, the prior's chaplain was sent for who staid with him till he died. The barber then attended, who put on him his socks and boots, and wound him in his cogle and habit. He was then conveyed to the dead men's chamber in the fermory and kept till night, when he was removed to S. Andrew's chapel, adjoining the dead chamber, till eight o'clock the following morning. The night before the funeral, two monks, friends or kindred of the deceased, were appointed by the prior as special mourners, 'sytinge all night on their knees at the dead corses feet,' the children of the aumery sitting on their knees in stalls on either side the corpse, read the Psalter throughout the night till the above hour in the morning, when the corpse was conveyed to the chapter, where it was met by the prior and the whole convent, who said the 'dirige' and offered prayers for his soul. After this the corpse was conveyed through the 'parler,' 'a place for merchants to utter their wares,' to the sanctuarie garth, where it was buried: a chalice of wax was laid on the breast, and the blue bed which had served the deceased during his lifetime being held over the grave by four monks, and afterwards given to the sexton as his perquisite for digging the grave, the whole was concluded by the ringing over the grave of a single peal. The same observances held good in the funeral of the priors, except that the chalice placed on their breasts might be of silver or other metal, and that they lay each under a marble stone. From the middle of the fourteenth century the priors were, with one exception, buried in the cathedral.

The novices were always six in number, and they were in statu pupillari for seven years; their master and instructor

being one of the oldest monks, 'that was lernede.' They had no wages for the first year, during which time it was their master's duty to see that they were properly provided with clothes and bedding. If any showed himself possessed of superior talents or industry he was sent to Oxford to study divinity; the rest being kept in the convent until they could understand their service and the Scriptures. At the end of the first year they were allowed to sing mass, and were furnished with the same yearly payment as the other monks who were not officers of the house, viz. 20s. a year, out of which sum they found themselves their apparel. They dined and supped in the frater-house with their master, at which time one of them, by his appointment, was accustomed to read from a high desk at the south end of the high table a chapter of the Old or New Testament from the Vulgate; which done, the master gave notice, by tolling of a 'gilden bell' that hung over his head, to one of the novices to say grace, 'and so after grace said they separated to their books.' A fair portion of time seems to have been dedicated to their studies. Both forenoon and afternoon of every day were given up to them, and the only recreation of which mention is made is, that a garden and bowling-alley belonged to the common room, in which the novices had occasionally permission to recreate themselves, the master always being present to keep order among them.

Next to the prior and sub-prior, the chief officers of the convent were as follows:—the master of the feretory, or keeper of S. Cuthbert's shrine. It was his duty to show the shrine to any person of note who desired to see it, and to receive their offerings, whether gold, silver, jewels, unicorn, elephant tooth, and the like. He had also the exhibition of S. Cuthbert's corporax cloth already mentioned, and his banner, which, like the corporax cloth, was considered a relic of singular virtue; as the former had overcome the Scottish black rood at the battle of Neville's Cross, so the latter brought home the King of Scotland's banner that was taken at Flodden. The same officer had also the supervision of the shrine of Bede, which, with S. Cuthbert's banner, was borne in solemn procession on the greater festivals.

The terrar had charge of the guest-chamber and its furniture. He had also to provide two hogsheads of wine for the use of the guests, and provender for their cattle, with three men to wait upon them. The chamberlain provided the bedding and clothing of the novices, which were always of wool. The master of the common-room had the duty of continually maintaining the fire there, and he was required moreover to have always in store a hogshead of wine for the monks, with spices, figs, and

walnuts for their Lent fasts. The prior's chaplain received from the bursar all sums of money due to the prior; he also provided the prior's apparel, furniture, and linen, and took charge of his plate and money. He accounted with the officers and servants of the prior of whatever rank and degree, and saw that they performed their duties quietly and with diligence.

One of the customs peculiar to the early ages of the country, and no doubt necessary for them, but which as soon as a good and efficient system of government began to be established in the country was at once done away, was the privilege of sanctuary. By this privilege criminals might repair to certain pre-appointed spots, and for a space of time receive exemption from the punishment of the law, and in cases of homicide from the vengeance of the next of heir. The king, being the vicar of Christ, conveyed this privilege first by his presence, which extended to the palace and three miles round it, and secondly, by his seal. The monastic church of Durham was one of those to which this privilege was granted; the minster of Beverley was another. The sanctuary extended in the former case merely to the church and churchyard, in the latter it comprised the space of a mile from the minster every way, and the stones (one of them at least) which marked the boundary are still to be seen.

The 'Rites of Durham' gives us a description of the manner of the culprit's seeking sanctuary, and the 'Sanctuarium Dunelmense et Sanctuarium Beverlacense' gives a history of the cases which sought and obtained sanctuary. The right of sanctuary was for the benefit of the graver malefactors; of those, for instance, who had committed manslaughter in their own defence, of those guilty of felony, horse-stealing, treason, coining, breaking of prison, and the like.

From the 'Rites of Durham' we extract the following account of the manner of a culprit seeking sanctuary. After the commission of his crime he—

'Fled to the Church dore and knocking and rapping at yt to have yt opened there were certen men that dyd lye alwaies in two chambers' [in a room is the correction of the Hunter MS.] 'over the said North Church dour, for the same purpose that when any such offenders dyd come and knocke streight waie they were letten in at any hour of the nyght, and dyd rynne streight waie to the Galleley bell, and tould it, to th' intent that any man that hard it might knowe that there was some man that had taken saunctuare. And when the Prior had intelligence thereof, then he dyd send word, and commanding that that they should keape themselves within the saunctuarij, that is to say within the church and churchyard; and every one of them to have a gowne of blacke cloth maid with a cross of yeallow cloth, called Sancte Cuthbert's cross, sett on his lefte shoulder of his arme, to th' intent that every one might se that there was such a frelige graunted by God and Sanct Cuthbert, for every such offender to fly unto for succour and safeguard of their lyves, unto such

ty me as they might obtayne their Prince's pardone, and that thei should lie within the church or saunctuarij in a grate, which grate is remayninge and standing still to this daie, being maid onlie for the same purpose, standing and adjoining unto the Gallelei dore on the south syde, and likewise they had meite, drink, and bedding, and other necessities of the House cost and charg, for 37 daies, as was meite for such offenders, unto such time as the Prior and the Convent could gett theme conveyed out of the dioces. This freedom was confirmed not only by King Guthrid but also by King Alured.'—*Rites of Durham*, pp. 35, 36.

The chamber, in question, is still visible over the north door of Durham cathedral, and the huge old knocker affixed to the door is believed to be that which was used to signify the applicant's need of admission. At Beverley the culprit betook himself to [the] Fridstol, or chair of peace (on which see Spelman's Glossary, v.v. Fridstoll, Fridstow, or Frithstow), which like that at Hexham is still preserved.

The offender was permitted at Durham to claim protection for forty days, during thirty-seven of which he was provided with food and bedding at the expense of the house. If at the expiration of this time he had not succeeded in making his peace, he appeared before the coroner, clothed in sackcloth, to confess his crime and abjure the realm. This was done in the terms following:—

'This hear thou, Sir Coroner, that I, M. of H., am a robber of sheep, or of any other beast, or a murderer of one, or of mo, and a felon of our Lord the King of England, and because I have done many such evils or robberies in his land, I do abjure the land of our Lord Edward, King of England, and I shall haste me towards the port of such a place as thou hast given me: and that I shall not go out of the highway, and if I do, I will that I be taken as a robber and a felon of our Lord the King: and that at such a place I will diligently seek for passage, and that I will tarry there but one flood and ebb, if I can have passage; and unless I can have it in such a place, I will go every day into the sea up to my knees, assaying to pass over: and unless I can do this within forty days, I will put myself again into the Church as a robber and a felon of our Lord the King, so God me help and His holy judgement.'—*Sanct.* pp. xviii. xix.

In the event of the culprit failing to make this confession and abjuration within the time specified, he was compelled to leave the sanctuary, it being felony for any one to supply him with food. At Beverley they were treated with more leniency. If the offender was a person of distinction, he had a lodging in the dormitory or in a house within the precincts. The privilege itself ceased, indeed, at the end of thirty days; but it still protected him to the borders of the county, and he could claim the same security a second and even a third time; but in the latter case he became for life a servant of the church. The abstract of the Durham sanctuary shows, that during the sixty years it embraces (from 1464 to 1524), 195 persons were actually guilty of murder and homicide, and 283 implicated, 16 of debt, 4 of

horse-stealing, 9 of cattle-stealing, 4 of escaping from prison, 4 of housebreaking, 1 of rape, 7 of theft, 1 of being backward in his accounts, 1 of harbouring a thief, and 1 of failing to prosecute. The Beverley record extends from 1478 to 1539, and gives 173 guilty of murder and homicide, 186 implicated, 51 guilty of felony, and 54 implicated, 1 of horse-stealing, 1 of treason, 1 of receiving stolen goods, 7 of coining, and the large number 208 of debt; in addition are 35 crimes indefinite. The fact that the register of Durham contains the names of several Yorkshire persons, shows that a distant sanctuary was sometimes preferred to one nearer home, and if so, we are justified in concluding that the privilege itself might not have been in all cases preserved from violation.

The antiquity of the privilege is certainly very great. It is known that Ina, King of the West Saxons, recognised it in his code of laws, published in 693. Two centuries later, King Alfred confirmed it, and enacted that if any one violated it by inflicting on the fugitive bonds, blows or wounds, he should firstly recompense the victim by payment of the were, or fine allotted to the offence; and secondly, pay the fine of one hundred and twenty shillings—a large sum in those days—to the Church. After him, William the Conqueror, Henry II., Richard II. and Henry VIII., all recognised its existence, and made enactments for its protection, nor was it finally abolished till the 21st of James I. A.D. 1624.

The Durham Ritual has now to be considered. This work is said to be the oldest specimen of the ancient language of the kingdom of Northumbria yet published; and to the Anglo-Saxon scholar its worth as such is evidently great: whether it be equally so to the theologian we will endeavour to ascertain. We are informed in the preface of the learned and careful editor, Mr. Stevenson, that it claims from tradition to have been the ritual of Aldfrid, king of Northumbria, who reigned from 685 to 705.

But here we are compelled to raise one or two preliminary objections. First, as regards the title of the Durham Ritual. There is nothing to show that this was the true and original title of the volume; and even if this point could be substantiated, it does not follow that the work so described must necessarily have been used in the services of the Church of Northumbria. It may have obtained its appellation from having been in the library of the church of Durham, just as particularly rare and valuable copies in these days often take the name of the place in which they are deposited.

In the next place, we have been equally at a loss to discover any evidence connecting the 'Ritual' with Aldfrid. Wanley,

who has left a description of it in 'Hicke's Thesaurus,' merely says that he recognises in it the handwriting of Aldred the presbyter, whom he affirms (but without offering any proof of the statement) to have lived in the reign of Aldfrid; and Mr. Stevenson assures us that it cannot have been the copy actually used by that monarch, but is at best a mere transcript of it, for the appearance of the character in which it is written, to use his own words, prevents it from claiming a higher antiquity than the commencement of the ninth century; and we shall also find that evidence drawn from its contents forbids us to ascribe it to his day. There is, nevertheless, unquestionable proof that it really is of great antiquity. At page 143 there is a prayer for Bishop Aldhelm, and at page 185 are four collects for grace and mercy through the intercession of S. Cuthbert, following which is a memorandum in Saxon that they were written by the Provost Aldred upon the festival of S. Lawrence, on a Wednesday, when the moon was five days old, for Celfsig the Bishop.

Aldhelm was the founder of the city and church of Durham, in which he sat as bishop from 990 to 1018. Celfsig, the last Bishop of Chester-le-Street, was his immediate predecessor, and his episcopate dates from 968 to 990. Dr. Lingard proves that Aldred's inscription must have been written A.D. 970, as that is the only year in which the festival of S. Lawrence would fall at once on a Wednesday, and on the 5th day of the moon; and we learn from Mr. Stevenson that the original contents have been erased to make room for it. This proves that it must be at least as old as the latter part of the tenth century; how much older, we proceed, as far as the liturgical part of the evidence allows, to show.

We must first, however, describe a volume which, if we cannot accord to it all its title claims, is yet most interesting from its language, its antiquity and its contents. It consists of 199 pages, but it is far from perfect. The first part, containing the services from the Nativity to the Epiphany, is wanting, and there are essential omissions both in the *Proprium de Tempore*, and in the *Proprium Sanctorum*, in addition to which the work has suffered the loss of several leaves, and in more instances than the one adduced, the original contents have been erased to make room for other, and as it would seem, less important matter.¹

The book commences in the middle of a capitulum, or series of short extracts from Holy Scripture, apparently for the festival of Epiphany. These are followed by eight collects for the Epiphany, from which the first part of the work (or

Proprium de Tempore, as it is styled in the breviary) continues, with some omissions, to the festival of Pasch.; then after a Rogation service, and prayers *pro peccatis*, comes the Proprium Sanctorum, commencing with the festival of S. Stephen, and concluding with that of S. Thomas. The Commune Sanctorum which follows, concludes in the middle of a prayer for many martyrs; and to this succeeds a number of prayers, benedictions, forms of adjuration, charms, services of ordeals, hymns, exorcisms, and other unconnected and miscellaneous matter, written by different hands and in different characters, and entered, says the editor, on the blank pages, as in a commonplace book.

The question is, what is the place in theology, and what the ritualistic value of a work of which the contents are so diversified?

We answer at once that its value, as illustrating the order of Divine Service in the Anglo-Saxon Church, is very slight, for it is but a small portion that can be considered as a ritual at all. In this view we agree both with Mr. Stevenson and Dr. Lingard. To begin with the Proprium de Tempore. Many of the collects of this part of the work are found in the ancient sacramentaries of Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory; but the most cursory inspection is enough to show that the breviary, rather than the old sacramentaries, is its original: with this difference, that each contains certain collects which are not found in the other. Thus there are eight collects for the Epiphany in the Ritual, of which three are in Gelasius, Gregory, and the breviary, and the rest are not to be found. The collects in the Ritual, from Septuagesima to the Passion inclusive, amount in number to sixty-five; of these seven are found in Gelasius and Gregory, and thirty-nine are taken from the breviary; of the origin of the remainder we are ignorant. It is to be wished, indeed, that these could be traced; but all we know is, that they are not in any of the sacramentaries—the Gothic, the Frankish, or either of the Gallican versions, contained in the work of Muratorius; and for anything that appears to the contrary, they may have been the composition of the compiler of the original work, of the transcriber of the present copy, or of any other private person.

We do not hesitate to say, that to us the Ritual bears much more the appearance of a book compiled from various sources for private devotion, than of one used in the public service of any Church.

It is Mr. Stevenson's opinion that the Ritual, if connected at all with King Aldfrid, may probably have been derived from Iona, where he was educated, and may, therefore, represent the

ritual of Britain, and not of Rome.¹ If this could be proved, it would undoubtedly be a relic of extraordinary value. But Bede's account of Aldfrid hardly bears out Mr. Stevenson's assertion. He says that Oswy, the father of Aldfrid, was instructed and baptized by the Scots, and thought nothing better than what they taught; but that Aldfrid, having been taught by Wilfrid, who had gone to Rome to learn the Ecclesiastical doctrine, thought that his doctrine ought to be preferred to the tradition of the Scots.² It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, as it strikes us, if a book of Aldfrid's bore, like the Ritual, so close a resemblance to the breviary as to be little other than a repetition of it. Nor must we forget that when S. Augustin landed in England there were in the island two different successions: the one, north of the Humber, derived from Iona, and introduced by Aidan and his successors; the other, south of that river, which had been planted by Germanus and Lupus. It is most probable that the ritual of each was different, and that their origin was derived from entirely different sources. There is no doubt as to the source of the original British ritual used south of the Humber; but there are two different opinions as to whence the other was derived, and as to what it was. Both opinions, of course, trace it through the monks of Iona to St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, but the learned are not agreed as to whence he himself obtained it. Some think he was consecrated by Germanus and Lupus, and adopted from them the Gallican ritual. Others follow the authority of his early biographers, who say that he received his apostolic commission from the hands of Pope Celestine: these naturally conclude that he brought with him the other Liturgy of the West, the Liturgy of Rome as it existed at that time, and with the Liturgy, the ritual. It is, indeed, barely possible, that the ritual reported to have been introduced into Ireland in the sixth century by David, Gildas, and Cadoc, all British saints, and which would, of course, be the Gallican, may have been carried from Ireland to Iona, and from thence into Northumbria; but there is no proof of this from history, and probability is much against the monks of Iona and the Church of Northumbria having changed their original ritual. If the Durham Ritual resembled the extant Gallican, which is the representative, as far as there is such, of the original British as opposed to the Roman, it would be made probable that the ritual of Iona, Ireland, and S. Patrick, was originally Gallican. But this is not the case. Putting out of the question the evidence afforded by the identity of so many of the collects

¹ Ritual, Preface, p. 9, note 2.² Bede, iii. chap. 25.

with those in the old Roman sacramentaries and the breviary, its calendar is constructed on the model of theirs, and, with the exception of the interpolated collects at p. 185, mentioning the name of S. Cuthbert, the *Proprium Sanctorum* contains the names of no British Saint whatever. In the next place, even if we grant the ritual of Northumbria to have been the Gallican, derived either through St. Patrick from Germanus and Lupus, or from David, Gildas, and Cadoc, in the sixth century, still, before King Aldfrid's days, its use had begun to decline. S. Gregory, as we all know, had directed S. Augustin, eighty years before, to form a ritual and liturgy for the island, based on the Roman, but taking anything he thought worthy of adoption from the British; and it had been shown at the Council of Whitby, twenty years before Aldfrid's time, that even north of the Humber, the Roman order was gaining ground, and the original Northumbrian, where it now differed from the Roman, declining. The utmost that can be granted Mr. Stevenson is, that *some* of the collects, the source of which is unknown, may possibly have been derived from the primitive British or Gallican Ritual, assuming that ritual to have penetrated north of the Humber. Yet whilst there is nothing positive in favour of this view, the fact that none of them are at all similar to those in the Gallican sacramentary, will be thought to go much against it: the great number of collects, too, for many of the festivals, would tend to show that the Ritual followed the custom of the Roman Church, before S. Gregory the Great, in the end of the sixth, or beginning of the seventh century, diminished the number of collects left by his predecessors Leo and Gelasius.

The *Proprium Sanctorum* affords some positive data by which to judge of the antiquity and value of the work. These appear to overthrow the opinion of Dr. Lingard as to its probable origin. That historian, from the fact of its containing collects for the festival of the nativity of S. Martin of Tours, (Nov. 11), and for the translation of his relics (July 4), conjectured that the original of the Ritual may have been a work belonging to the monastery of S. Martin, at Tours, from whence a copy was perhaps brought to England by those who visited Alcuin there. He proceeds, however, to argue from the *Proprium Sanctorum* containing, as he says, the names of only one confessor (S. Benedict, which he thinks was undoubtedly interpolated after the reported transport of his remains to Fleury in 653), and from its having been the custom of the Church of Rome in early ages to reject from her calendar the names of doctors and confessors, and to admit those of martyrs only, that it is a work of Roman origin; and from its having

several collects for each of the greater festivals, he concludes that it is to be dated at some period before the reform of S. Gregory.

To these suggestions we answer as follows:—1. Competent judges have decided that the Durham Ritual was written by a Scotch or Irish scribe; for it contains features of resemblance in its material, style of execution, and other points, to MSS. of a known Irish origin. 2. The Roman and Gallican rituals were perfectly distinct both in their contents and calendar. S. Gregory reformed the one, but had nothing whatever to do with the other. This was the ritual used in the Gallican Church in the days of Aldfrid, and till the time of Charlemagne. When, therefore, Dr. Lingard concludes that it may have been a copy of a Roman sacramentary used in the Abbey of S. Martin, he seems to have forgotten that such a book in use at Tours at the end of the seventh and beginning of the eighth century, would have been an anomaly. Moreover, we know that the custom of those ages was rather to carry MSS. from England into France than to bring them from that country hither.

As to the mention of S. Martin's name among those of the saints, it is not at all needful to go to a Gallican source for that. Dr. Lingard could not have been aware that in those ages S. Martin was held in peculiar respect in Northumbria and the south of Scotland, and he is expressly said by Bede to have been the patron saint of Candida Casa, or Withern, where Mirian, the apostle of the southern Picts, built a stone church and dedicated it to him.¹ From Candida Casa, afterwards erected into an episcopal see, we conclude that S. Martin's name found its way into the Durham Ritual, or its original, with collects composed either by Mirian himself or one of his successors. Certain it is, that the collects for S. Martin's two days in the Ritual resemble neither those of the breviary, nor of the Gallican sacramentary. Dr. Lingard ought to have noticed this discrepancy, and, if possible, have explained it; as it is, we think it alone almost fatal to his theory. Nor is it the fact that the Ritual excludes the names of confessors to the extent that he says. It seems to have escaped him that in addition to S. Benedict, it mentions Sylvester, ii. Kal. Jan. (30 Dec. p. 49); S. Felix, xviii. Kal. Feb. (15 Jan.) xix. in breviary; Marcellus xvi. Kal. Feb. (17 Jan.) xvii. in breviary; Eusebius Presbyter. xviii. Kal. Sep. (15 Aug.) xix. in breviary; and S. Mark, Pope, Nones of Oct. (7 Oct.). Of these, Sylvester, Eusebius, and Mark are expressly styled confessors in their collects; and as to Marcellus, the collect of the Ritual in which he is called

¹ Bede, book xiii. chap. 4.

'martyris,' is that of the breviary and the sacramentary of S. Gregory. In the earlier sacramentary of Gelasius he is called confessor; nothing is said by Baronius, Ruinart, or Butler, to show whether he was a martyr or confessor. His acts assert the former; but these are confessedly spurious, and from the indirect testimony of history, and from the sacramentary of Gelasius, it seems most probable that he was merely a confessor. It is remarkable that in addition to the names of confessors, the Ritual omits those of certain of the martyrs, as S. Polycarp, Ignatius, and others of like note; more even than this—and we cannot but consider it a further proof that the work never could have been the ritual of a Church—it makes no mention of the Apostles Matthias, Barnabas, and Matthew.

It is a significant fact, that while the Ritual omits the festivals of these Apostles, it contains some of which the antiquity is more than questionable: *e.g.* those of the Nativity (of B.V.M.), and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of All Saints. For the first, Pope Sergius appointed a litany and homilies in 688. Bede (A.D. 673-735) mentions it in his martyrology, and Archbishop Boniface A.D. 755, speaks of it with other festivals in his canons, as they are given by D'Acheri in the ninth vol. of his *Spicilegium*, and directs it to be observed on the vi. Ides or 8th of September. Moreover, although it has a mass and collect in the sacramentary of Gelasius and Gregory, there is no mention of the day in the more ancient one of S. Leo, and it is wanting in the Gothic, Frankish, and the two versions of the Gallican sacramentary given by Muratorius.

The Festival of the Assumption is admitted even by some Romish ritualists to have been instituted as late as the eighth century. Pope Sergius, indeed, mentions it with the Nativity (of B.V.M.), but under the term 'Dormitio,' which conveys—whatever Romish writers may say—a totally different idea to that contained in the word 'assumptio.' The first formal and public mention of the Festival of the Assumption seems to have been made in the Council of Mentz, A.D. 813; the thirty-fifth canon of which enumerates it with some others.¹ It was celebrated in the Gallican Church on the 18th of January, on which day collects are appointed for it both in the Gothic and Gallican sacramentaries.² Those of Gelasius,³ and Gregory,⁴ and the Martyrology of Bede, put it on the xviii. Kal. Sep. (Aug. 15).

But when reliance is placed on the ancient sacramentaries, not merely as a whole (in which respect it cannot be doubted that they represent with fidelity the ancient services of the Latin

¹ Harduin, tom. iv. p. 1015.

² Muratorius, vol. i. 663.

³ Muratorius, vol. ii. pp. 45, 811.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 114.

Church), but also in each particular service, we must remember that the authorship of S. Leo's (the most ancient of all and the foundation of the others) is matter of doubt; the name of that pope having been given to it only by conjecture and the evidence of probability; and that the exact date of the MSS. of his and the other sacramentaries is not known with any certainty, and has to be settled almost entirely from internal evidence. Muratorius admits that the true authorship of Leo's sacramentary cannot be decided, and that it is not at all known what was the order of the services in the Latin Church for the first four centuries. He prints the sacramentary of S. Gregory from a MS. which dates no further back than about the first half of the ninth century; and in our estimation he is perfectly correct, when he prefers his own version to that of Menard, and affirms that it is the most ancient, and therefore the best representative of the genuine text of S. Gregory of any yet discovered. But he admits, firstly, that no copy showing the pure and veritable text of the work is extant or is now to be hoped for;¹ secondly, that all have additions of festivals since S. Gregory's time; thirdly, that the Festival of the Assumption in particular was not known either to Gelasius or to Gregory; but, like some others was inserted into their sacramentaries at some subsequent period; and he makes the simple remark, that as no one doubts the sacramentary of S. Gregory to be his because it contains certain prayers, festivals, and rites, which were evidently added since his death, so neither do the interpolations which it cannot be denied have been made in that of Gelasius, at all weaken our confidence that is the veritable work of that pope.² Our readers will readily reply that such adulterations do very materially diminish our confidence in both. It is evidently impossible to say what amount of addition was made during the two centuries and a half that elapsed between the death of S. Gregory and the transcription of the most ancient copies now extant of his sacramentary; and consequently the presence of a particular festival or festivals does not prove that such were necessarily known to its original author, or formed any part of the service of the Church in which it was used during his life.

But the Ritual contains in itself clearer evidence than the presence of these collects, that it never could have been used *as it stands* by King Aldfrid. It has four collects for the festival of All Saints. This was instituted the last of all the festivals, that of Trinity Sunday excepted. Martene, Baronius, and Butler, who follows Baronius, say that it was established by the middle of the eighth century. It is not

¹ Muratorius, i. p. 63—78.

² Ibid. vol. i. pp. 58, 59.

mentioned by the Council of Mentz; but we find from the 'Metrical Martyrology' of Bede that it was celebrated in his time. Bede, who died in 735, thus alludes to it:—

'Multipliei rutillet gemma ceu in fronte November
Cunctorum fulget sanctorum laude decorus.'

And lastly, the day is mentioned by Archbishop Egbert, in his 'Pontificale,' which was composed towards the middle of the eighth century. If, indeed, we follow Lingard, we must put it at the end of that century, such being the date ascribed to it by him from a passage in a letter written by Alcuin in the year 799. This would make the original work of the same antiquity as that ascribed to the copy, from the evidence of the penmanship &c., by Mr. Stevenson: but as his premiss is so evidently erroneous, his conclusion may be false also; and this we think to be the case. The MS. in our estimation may, indeed, be substantially the copy of a work which was used by King Aldred, but with the addition of particular festivals, such as was made to the sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory in a subsequent age, certainly showing that it was not transcribed, at the earliest, till about thirty years after his death.

The forms of exorcism, consecration, &c. in the Ritual are not peculiar to it. Some of them are found also in the Missal. Some agree both with the Missal and with Goar's Euchologium as used by the Greek Church; and what is the most singular feature of the case, some correspond closely with the Euchologium and have nothing at all in common with the Missal. Thus there are two forms of exorcism of salt in the Ritual. The first, at page 117, very closely resembles, and the second, at page 119, is to a word identical with, that in the Missal. The same is the case with the two consecutive forms of exorcising and consecrating water. The first of these in the Durham Ritual ends abruptly in the middle of a word, 'Jesus Christus qui ven—.' The form in the Missal enables us to supply what is wanting: 'venturus est judicare vivos et mortos et sæculum per ignem. Amen.' So, also, with the prayer for the blessing of salt and water, at the 122d page of the Ritual: a few words have dropped out from the commencement, which the form in the Missal enables us at once to supply and correct. The former runs as follows: 'Deus . . . virtutis auctor et inseparabilis . . . rex.' We find it in the Missal: 'Deus invictæ virtutis auctor et insuperabilis imperii rex.' The Ritual contains a few other verbal errors, the result apparently of the scribes' ignorance of the Latin language. Thus the 'qui hostiles nequitiæ potens expugnans' in the

Ritual, the Missal reads correctly, 'potenter expugnas;' and again, 'more,' in the expression 'ut pietatis tue more sanctifices' in the Ritual, is corrected by the Missal to 'rore.'

The following form for exorcising salt is taken from the Ritual; and while differing in letter from one in the Missal, is the same in spirit.

'I exorcise thee, O thou creature of Salt, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who commanded thee to be cast by Elisha into the water that the sterility of the same might be healed: who said with His Divine voice to His Apostles, Ye are the salt of the earth; that all who take of it (*sic*) may be made whole in mind and body, and whereon it is sprinkled it may afford to all remission of sins, and healing to the protection of health, that all temptations of the Devil may be driven away and shut out from them, in the name of God the Father Almighty, and of Jesus Christ His Son, who is about to come in the Holy Ghost and judge the world through fire.'—P. 117.

In Goar it is as follows:—

'O God our Saviour, who was present to Elisha the prophet in Jericho, and healedest by means of salt the hurtful waters, do Thou bless this salt, and change it into a sacrifice of rejoicing (*eis θυσίαν ἀγαλλιαστίως*),¹ for Thou art ever God, and to Thee, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we ascribe the glory now and ever and ever.'—P. 105.

Of the last class, those forms, namely, which correspond to none in the Missal, but are similar to certain contained in the Euchologium, is that of a blessing on meat. The Anglo-Saxon prayed that God would bless his banquet as He blessed those of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and changed the water into wine at the marriage feast. The Greek prayed Him, as the Heavenly Bread which came down from above and gave life to the world, and as the true nourishment of every man, to bless the food and drink, and to suffer them to be partaken without condemnation. For a blessing on his nets, the Anglo-Saxon prayed as follows:—

'Let Thy plentiful blessing, we beseech Thee, O Lord, come upon these nets, that for the hunting of beasts, through the gift of Thy grace and the benefactions of Thy bounty, we may merit to pay Thee heavenly thanks (*celestes gratias tibi absolvere mereamur*).—P. 117.

Again:—

'Grant, we pray Thee, Almighty God, through aspersion of this water and holy salt, Thou mayst command these nets which are signed in Thy Name to be made fruitful for human service to the taking of beasts, that we may refer to Thee for Thy praise everything which through Thy grace we may merit to partake—per Dominum, &c.'

In Goar we find the following prayer on the same subject:—

¹ Goar thinks, from these words, that the whole prayer bears reference to the salt which the Greeks used with leaven in the bread of the Holy Eucharist; but there is nothing in the anarthrous *θυσίαν* to fix this sense to the words.

‘O Lord our God, who from five loaves and two fishes didst satisfy five thousand, and of the fragments commandedst a quantity to be collected; Do Thou, the same Lord Almighty, bless these nets which are placed before Thee through the *πρεσβειων* of our superlatively blessed glorious Lady, the Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, and the holy, glorious, and all celebrated Apostle Peter; and guard those that eat of the fish taken by them, in peace and health both of body and mind: for Thou art the Giver of all good things, and to Thee do we ascribe the glory, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and for ever and ever. Amen.’

To account for this resemblance is a matter of difficulty. Where the forms agree in all the books, it is clear that there must have been some original source which the others copied, and this would probably be found in the Roman book. But we know not how to explain the agreement between the Ritual and the Euchologium alone, except by a supposition which may or may not find favour in the eyes of our readers. We suggest that it may be traceable to Archbishop Theodore, who was a Greek by birth, and the first Archbishop of Canterbury who was able to exercise his metropolitical powers over the whole island. He, or his scholars, of whom we know that he had a numerous and able staff, may have introduced into the Anglo-Saxon a form, or forms, of prayer derived from the Greek Church; and as Theodore died in the year 690, we might naturally look for any remains of his in a MS. of the date of the later portion of the Durham Ritual. And if it be objected that there are many forms in the Euchologium which bear no resemblance to those in the Ritual on the same subject, we reply that this may be thought a fact confirmatory rather than destructive of our suggestion. For Theodore is known to have thoroughly identified himself as a divine with the Latin Church in her growing discords with that of the Greeks, and therefore his bent and feelings would not have allowed him to incorporate into the one much that was derived from the other.

With one more curious extract we will close our notice of the Durham Ritual.

In the Anglo-Saxon forms of exorcising *boiling water* and *heated iron* in trials by ordeal, we see that what to us savours of romance and marvel, was to our ancestors a matter of most profound faith, and earnest, solemn reality: a direct appeal to the judgment of God, which could by no possibility err, and which no man might doubt or gainsay. The following form of exorcising heated iron for the detection of crime is found in the original portion of the Ritual. We do not know it to be that which was used in the Church of Northumbria for the purpose, but it may have been; and if so, it would probably, *mutatis mutandis*, be the same in substance as that employed in the case

of Emma, queen-mother of Edward the Confessor. For although the 'Consuetudo,' as it was termed, or, as we translate it, the 'Use,' of Winchester was not the same as that of Durham or York; yet the ritual of the country in those ages was, as a whole, one from which the 'Uses' were merely local and slight variations. Under these circumstances, and as the form is so interesting in itself, and bears reference to a custom so well known and so peculiar, we venture to offer our readers a translation of it:—

'O God, who showing through fire great wonders didst pluck Thy servant Abraham from the fire of the Chaldees when many perished: O God, who sufferedst the bush to burn in the sight of Moses, yet not to be consumed: O God, who broughtest from the burning furnace of Chaldæa Thy three children when many perished therein: O God, who involvedst in the consuming fire the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, and gavest salvation to Lot Thy servant and his household: O God, who before Thy coming by the purification of Thy Holy Spirit of Fire didst separate thy Faithful from Thine Unfaithful; show us in this test of our littleness the virtue of the same Holy Spirit, and by the heat of this Fire separate the believing and unbelieving, that, conscious by its touch of theft or other crime of which inquisition is made, their hands may be shrivelled up, or their feet may in some measure be burned; but if free, let them be wholly delivered from its operation and remain without hurt.'—P. 112.

Our conclusion as to this remarkable work is then, on the whole, that it is a compilation of collects from old sacramentaries and the breviary, mingled with prayers from some other source or sources unknown; and that while it is exceedingly doubtful that it ever belonged to King Aldfrid, it may be certainly granted to be nearly or quite as old as the most ancient copies of the sacramentaries now in existence. The copy of Leo's sacramentary published by Blanchinus is perhaps the most ancient *copy*, as well as the most ancient sacramentary, of any; but Blanchinus himself does not venture to put it further back than from the eighth to the ninth century; there is mention in it of Simplicius, who was pope after Leo's time; whilst Muratorius supposes it to belong rather to Felix III. than to S. Leo: and the same is the case with the other two sacramentaries. That of Gelasius, edited by Thomasius, is given by Basnage to the tenth century, but is judged by Muratorius to be one hundred years older. Muratorius' own copy of the sacramentary of Gregory, he says, is at least the second most ancient known, yet it dates no further back, as we have said before, than the first half of the ninth century: the earlier copy, which is in the Vatican, apparently belonging quite to the beginning of that century. This would appear to be the transcript of a yet older work; for it has no festival for All Saints, nor any service for the Rogation Days; yet it may not be

itself older as a copy than the Durham Ritual. And as, of course, the Durham Ritual shares in the doubtfulness of these copies, though it be as old as any of them, these circumstances render it of much more value to the antiquarian than it can be to the Liturgical scholar.

A pontificale is a service book containing those offices—of ordination, consecration, the coronation of kings, the giving of certain benedictions, and in the Western Church, confirmation—which a bishop only can perform. Martene gives extracts from several works of this class which have been used in different churches, amongst which is that of S. Dunstan; but until the publication by the Surtees Society of Archbishop Egbert's, the only pontificale in print was that now in use in the Church of Rome. It is significant and instructive to compare the two.

Egbert's Pontificale commences with the service for the consecration of a bishop. Its chief component parts are the prayers for God's presence and grace on the person ordained; the unction of his hands and head; the bestowal of the pastoral staff and ring; and the episcopal benedictions on the bishop and host. In these points the Pontificale of Egbert agrees with the one now in use in the Roman Church. But there are in the essential points of the service many and grave differences between them. Egbert's Pontificale makes the spiritual power conferred to be given immediately and solely by God: '*Da ei Domine claves regni cœlorum ut quodcunque ligaverit super terram sit ligatum et in cœlis, et quodcunque solverit super terram sit solutum in cœlis, et quorum detinuerit peccata detenta sint, tu Domine, dimittere digneris.*' The modern office implies that such power is bestowed only through S. Peter and his successors the popes. Egbert merely speaks of that Apostle as chosen firstly to the chair of honour, and enumerates S. Matthias as sharing with him and the other Apostles both in his Apostleship and in the same chair of honour, praying finally that the newly consecrated bishop may be not *their* servant merely, to give account to them, but *their* equal. The result of this difference is, that Egbert's book contains none of the vows of obedience to S. Peter and the Church of Rome, the Pope or the papal nuncios and legates, which are found in the Roman Pontificale; nor does he, like the latter, make the newly consecrated bishop accountable to the Pope. This work, therefore, contains fresh proof, if any were needed, not merely that the Church in this island was originally free from the control of that of Rome; but also, which is still more important, and has often been denied by Romish controversialists, that the introduction of the Romish succession, customs, and ritual by S. Augustine and his successors, whilst

bringing the two Churches into close communion, did not place the British on the footing of a servant or subject to the Romish. There is sufficient evidence in this part of Egbert's work to show that the Roman Pontificale was his model in compiling it: more than one of the prayers are identical, and the ceremonies of enduing the new bishop with the symbols of his office, the unction of his hands, the giving of the pastoral staff, the putting on of the ring, are, in fact, the same in both: only, whilst the modern pontificale binds every bishop consecrated with its rites to be the servant of the successor of S. Peter, and whomsoever he may depute to fill his office for the time being, it is clear that Archbishop Egbert considered himself as possessed in his office of the same essential power and the same freedom as the Bishop of Rome himself. No one, taking his book as it stands, could imagine that there was any earthly potentate to whom he considered himself and those whom he consecrated bishops to be accountable.

The form of ordination of the other seven orders of clergy acknowledged by the Church of Rome may be dismissed very briefly. The Roman Pontificale is again for the most part the model of the services in Egbert's book. An address in Egbert's form of ordination of readers gives what is not in the Pontificale of Rome: the reason of admitting so many orders and no more, viz. she considers Christ to have filled them.

'He was an *ostiarus* when He opened the door of the ark of Noah and the gates of hell: He was a *reader* when He opened the Book of the Prophet Isaiah in the Jewish synagogue and read, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me:" He was an *exorcist* when He cast out the seven devils from Mary Magdalene: He was a subdeacon when He blessed the water at the marriage feast and turned it into wine: He was a *deacon* when He broke the five loaves among the five thousand men, and the seven loaves among the four thousand, and when He washed the feet of His disciples: He was a *presbyter* when He took in His holy hands the bread and the cup, and looked up to heaven and gave thanks and blessed them: He was a *bishop* when with uplifted hands He blessed the disciples at Bethany, and leading them out was taken up into heaven.'

We gather from the Pontificale of Egbert that one doctrine, at least, of modern Rome—that of offering spiritual service for the dead—was unknown to the Church of the Anglo-Saxons. The Roman Pontificale, in the service for the ordination of deacons, gives them 'the power of reading the Gospel in church for the living as for the dead.' Archbishop Egbert when giving them a copy of the Gospels simply charges them to read, understand, hand them down to others, and fulfil them by their own works. In like manner, the commission given to priests in the Roman Pontificale, 'of offering sacrifice to God and celebrating mass as well for the living as for the dead,' is wholly wanting

in Egbert's. The Anglo-Saxon Church, as we find from this volume, also followed the primitive Liturgies, in offering prayers that spiritual gifts might be bestowed through her agency, instead of positively declaring that they were so, as is the more modern custom, at least, in the West. Thus the service for the ordination of priests prays simply that powers and graces may be given to him, and contains nothing at all answering to the gifts of the keys in the Romish Pontificale and our own ordinal.

The Society has also conferred on us a few works illustrative of the early language of our island, prominent among which stands the 'Townley Mysteries.' This is a collection of those miracle plays or mysteries, which were so popular with our ancestors, and the revival of which has, as we know, been attempted in the present day in the south of France. The 'Townley Mysteries' were compiled, as the editor gives good reason to conclude, by the monks, either of Woodkirk or of Nostel, in Yorkshire. They consist of dramatic poems on different Scripture subjects. The first is on the creation, and the *dramatis personæ* are Jehovah himself, and the good and bad angels:—

'Ego sum Alpha et O,
I am the First and Last also,
One God in Magiste.
Marvelose of myght most,
Fader, Son, and Holy Ghost,
One God in Trinyte.'

Jehovah is then represented as leaving His throne, on which Lucifer, induced by pride and presumption, seats himself. A dialogue ensues between the good and evil angels; the former remonstrating, the latter supporting their leader, after whose fall we find in the lament of the first demon an allusion to the Rabbinical traditions, one of which makes Satan to have been the first in rank of all creatures, and the nearest to Jehovah himself:—

'What alyd the Lucifer to falle,
Was thou not farist of angels alle,
Brightest and best and most of luf,
With God hymself that syttes aboyf?'

And the other, borrowed by Origen and adopted by S. Anselm, that there were originally ten orders of angels, and that the tenth of each order fell with Lucifer:—

'Ten orders in Heven were,
Of Angels that had office sere,
Of ich order in thare degree,
The ten parte felle down with me.
For they held with me that tyde,
And mantenyd me in my pride.'

God is next represented as creating man after the fall of Satan, according to the common idea of the times, that the number of the fallen angels might be filled up and perfected by that of the saved among men, which, it was also thought, was to equal the number of lost angels.¹

'Alle that is in water or land,
It shall bowe unto this Hand,
And sufferan shalle thou be.
I gif the witt—I gif the strength,
Of alle thou sees of brede and lengthe,
Thou shalte be wonde wise:
Myrthe and joy to have at wille,
All thi liking to fulfille,
And dwelle in paradise.'

Eve is then created, and charge is given to the cherubim to place them in Eden; and the MS. ends abruptly with the avowed determination of Satan and his crew to procure their ejection:—

'Herken felows what I say,
The joy that we have lost for aye,
God has maide man with his bend,
To have that blis withouten end,
The nine ordre to fulfille.
That after we left, sich is his wille,
And now are they in Paradise,
Bot thens they shalle if we be wise.'

The patriarchs are introduced in other poems, Noah as issuing from the ark, Abraham as about to sacrifice Isaac, Isaac as blessing Jacob, Jacob as fleeing before Esau. The prophets; Pharaoh, Moses, Augustus Cæsar, Herod, and John the Baptist are also brought on the stage with many others. There is the Annunciation; the Salutation of Elizabeth; the Dialogue of the Shepherds; the Offering of the Magi; the Betrayal, Scourging, and Crucifixion; the Ascension and the Final Judgment; the whole concluding with a fragment in the form of a monologue on the death of Judas Iscariot. From the salutation of Elizabeth, which is one of the most characteristic and poetical pieces of the whole, we offer our readers the following extract:—

'M. My lord of heven that sytts he,
And alle thyng seys withe ee,
The safe Elizabethe.
E. Welcom Mary blyssed blome,
Joyfulle am I of thi come,
'To me from Nazarethe.
M. How standes it with you of quart? (heart)
E. Welle my doghter and dere hart,
As can for myn elde.

¹ See S. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, book i. chap. xvi.—xviii.

- M.* To speke with you me thocht fulle lang,
For ye with childe in elde gang,
And ye be cald geld.
- E.* Fulle lang shalle I the better be,
That I may speke my fyllle with the,
My dere kyns-woman.
- To wytt how thi freyndes fare,
In thi countre where thay are,
Thereof telle me thou can.
- And how thou farys my dere derlyng?
- M.* Welle dame, gramercy youre asking,
For good I wot ye speir.
- E.* And Joachym thy fader at hame,
And Anna my nese and thi dame,
How standes it with hym and hir?
- M.* Dame, yit are thay bothe on lyfe,
Bothe Joachim and Anna his wyfe,
- E.* Elles were my hart full sare.
- M.* Dame God that alle may
Yeld you that you say,
And blys you therefore.
- E.* Blyssed be thou of alle women,
And the fruyte that I welle ken,
Within the wombe of the.
- And this tyme may I blyss,
That my lorde's moder is,
Comen thus unto me.
- For syn that tyme fulle welle I wote,
The steven of Angelle voice it smote,
And rang now in myne ere.
- A selcouthe thyng is me betyde,
The chylde makes joy as any byrd,
That I in body bere.
- And als Mary blessed be thou,
That stedfastly wold trow,
The wordes of our heven Kyng.
- Therefore all thyng shall now be brend,
That unto the were sayd or send,
By the Angell gretying.'

Mary then utters the Magnificat, after which, from the nature of the case, we suppose, though contrary to the order of the Gospels, she at once takes her leave of Elizabeth:—

- M.* Elezebeth my awnt dere,
My lefe I take at you here,
For I dwelle now fulle lang.
- E.* Wyllle thou now go Gode's sere,
Come kys me doghter with good chere,
Or thou hend gang.
- Fare welle now thou frely foode,
I pray thee be of comfurthe goode,
For thou art fulle of grace;

Grete welle alle our kyn of bloode,
That Lord that the with grace infude,
He save alle in this place.'

Before we take our leave of this valuable and instructive collection of works, we will recommend to the Anglo-Saxon scholar, the Society's edition of the 'Lindisfarne Gospels,' and of the 'Anglo-Saxon and Early English Psalter.' The former consists of a transcript of the Gospel of S. Matthew, according to the Vulgate, with an interlineary Anglo-Saxon version; the latter of the Psalter, also from the Vulgate, with an Anglo-Saxon version, with the addition of a poetical translation in early English. Of this we should have been glad, had space allowed, to give a few specimens.

Not the least interesting work of the series is that which contains the life of Mr. Surtees himself, by the late lamented Dr. Raine. He was the friend of many of the *literati* of the period, and among the rest of Sir Walter Scott; and we cannot forbear a wish, as we close the volume, that the 'great magician' could have had the use of so many works of a kind that he delighted in. This we cannot doubt would at once have greatly pleased himself, and from the use he might have made of some of them, would have been a benefit of no small amount to the nation at large.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Present Position of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.* By EDWARD B. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Dean of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Grant. London: Rivingtons.

2. *An Appeal. The Scottish Civil Disabilities of 1792. The Scottish Communion Office and Civil and Religious Liberty.* By a LAYMAN of the Scottish Episcopal Church. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1862.

On the 16th of April, 1746, the issue of the battle of Culloden put an end to all the hopes of the adherents of the House of Stuart. It was followed, as was natural, by the attainder of the most active and distinguished partisans of the fallen dynasty. As the Earl of Derwentwater and Lord Kenmure had suffered death upon the scaffold in 1715, so now, for the same cause and with equal dignity, did the Earl of Kilmarnock and Lord Balmerino lay down their lives—

‘Pitied by gentle hearts Kilmarnock died;
The brave, Balmerino, were on thy side.’

Both in 1716 and 1746 the titles and estates of many nobles who escaped, or obtained pardons, were forfeited.

But no sooner were the House of Hanover seated firmly upon the throne, than, to its great and lasting honour, it commenced a series of reversals of these attainders. In some cases, indeed, the failure of the direct line, or other circumstances, may have thwarted these conciliatory measures. The ample estates of Lord Derwentwater still support Greenwich Hospital, and have not returned to any member of the house of Ratcliff. But even so early as 1760, George III. restored the family of the Earl Marischal (Keith) to its ancient honours. A similar course of action was pursued throughout his long reign and in that of his successor. The last of the Stuarts in the male line, Cardinal York, received from the Prince Regent (afterwards George IV.) a pension of 4,000*l.* a year; and when he died in 1807, the monument raised to his memory in St. Peter's, Rome, was ordered, and its expense defrayed, by the same benefactor. Different opinions may be entertained about the merit of Canova's workmanship (though this particular monument has always seemed to us one of his best), but there can be but one opinion about the truly princely character of the act. Well, indeed, may we say, *O si sic omnia!* In this reign the chief of the clan Ogilvy was rehabilitated in his earldom; and the

present lord of 'the bonnie house of Airlie' confronts as a representative peer the head of the once hostile clan of the Campbells. But the most marked instance of reversal has been reserved for the reign of our present Sovereign. There was condemned, together with Lords Kilmarnock and Balmerino, another peer, the Earl of Cromarty; but his sentence was remitted in so far as concerned his life.¹ To the beautiful representative of this condemned nobleman, the present Duchess of Sutherland, the Queen has extended an extraordinary act of favour. The title of 'Countess of Cromarty in her own right' has been granted to this lady, with remainder to her *second* son, so that it may not hereafter be merged in the dukedom to which the eldest is heir.

In no one instance, we believe, has the passage of these bills of reversal through the Houses of Parliament been opposed. Nor has there been any miserable haggling about terms. No implied slight upon the memory of ancestors, no resignation of one particle of Scottish law, of Scottish use or custom, has ever been sought at the hands of the restored chieftains, as a condition of their restitution to the rights and dignities enjoyed by their forefathers. No; the gift has been re-bestowed in a manner worthy of the great Sovereigns of a great nation. Homage and allegiance (long previously rendered) have been asked—and nothing more.

And as these restorations have been given, so, too, have they been received. The reigning House has no more loyal subjects than the descendants of the councillors who met Prince Charles Edward in his drawing-room at Holyrood, such as Lochiel, Lord George Murray, Lord Nairne. The Lord Elcho of 1745 was amongst the last to quit the field of Culloden; the Lord Elcho of 1862 is amongst the foremost originators and leaders of those Volunteers who rally round the throne of Queen Victoria.

And yet, strange to say, there is one class of men, one only, which still suffers because their predecessors adhered to the conquered cause. While the *natural* heirs of those who imperilled the Hanoverian rule enjoy their ancient power and position, the *spiritual* descendants of the Scottish bishops of that date remain under a ban of English *State* (not *Church*) law, from which priests of the Greek and Roman Churches are exempt. To this day, no clergyman ordained by the bishops in Scotland is permitted to hold the smallest preferment—no, not even a curacy—in England; nor can he (without a constantly

¹ The pardon was granted simply because it was desirable to show *some* clemency, and not to put all three lords to death. The reasons for selecting Lord Cromarty are given by Sir Walter Scott and other historians of the time.

renewed license) officiate for more than two consecutive days. That they should not be placed in all respects on a *perfect* level, as regards preferment, with clergy ordained in England may be right and reasonable; but so long as the present state of the law exists, so long must we consider it a blot upon the English code, a blemish on the fair scutcheon from which every other trace of anti-Stuartite legislation has long since vanished.

On political grounds, solely and exclusively, were those disabilities imposed. No theological question whatever was mixed up with the laying on of these restrictions; and surely to every fair and generous mind it must be obvious, as a natural consequence, that no such question *ought* to be mixed up with the taking off this yoke. In the case of the Churches of Rome, of the East, of America, no hint of such a difficulty has ever been made. One of the most distinguished members of the Lower House of Convocation has received American Orders. When the bill for enabling him to hold an English living passed through Parliament, did any layman, did any prelate, say one word about the national office in use in America?

Now, other and better reasons for not treating the Scotch orders like those of Rome, Greece, or the United States, *may* exist; but it is, unfortunately, quite impossible to exclude all suspicion of an element which, whether its intrusion be consciously felt or not, is but too likely to exercise great influence. It is this: that the other communions to which we have alluded are large and powerful, whereas that which is presided over by Scottish bishops is, comparatively, very small and weak.

Let it not be said that, in speaking thus, we are adducing a novel charge, or playing an unpatriotic part. It is not a novel charge, for though there are moments when the better mind of England triumphs, and raises her far above all such unworthy considerations, yet, alas! too often does she sink below that lofty standard of thought and action, and justly incur, on this head, the language of warning and rebuke. Nor is it from foreign lands alone that such a voice proceeds. We hear it (and it is a good sign that it should be heard) from our own press, our own political leaders and historians. Thus, some sixteen years since, did a Quarterly Reviewer, in connexion with our present subject, speak 'of that inclination to domineer, in which, manifestly, we are to reckon one of our besetting sins.' Thus, at the present moment, do the Scotch lawyers complain, and with too much foundation, of the great disregard shown to North British law in the cases of appeals to the House of Lords. Thus did Lord Derby, with his wonted eloquence, lay down the rule that, in addressing a small power like that of Greece, the Foreign Minister ought to couch all documents in language as

courteous and deferential as that employed towards great powers, such as Russia or the United States; or that if any distinction were made, it should be in favour of the weaker nation. Not very dissimilar is the insinuation conveyed in the following words of a thinker of a very different stamp, Dr. Arnold:—‘Elizabeth’s own views were shared by a large portion of her people; they utterly abhorred the papal supremacy, with an English feeling quite as much as a religious one; it is not clear that they would have abhorred it equally had the papal see been removed for ever from Rome to Canterbury, and the Pope been necessarily an Englishman.’¹ It is making Canterbury resemble Rome, in one of its most oppressive characteristics, if, in order to enjoy full communion with the English Church, other Churches are to be called upon to use her liturgy, and none other.

Most unhappily, as it seems to us, two questions, in no wise necessarily connected, have become entangled with each other: by what agency, we will not pause to ask, but content ourselves, at present, with recognising and deploring the fact. Whether certain political disabilities, imposed on purely political grounds, shall be removed or not is one question; whether a certain communion office shall be abolished or not is another. So far are the two points from standing or falling together, that we can assert from our own knowledge that Scottish Churchmen, both lay and cleric, will be found to exhibit in the presence of these two questions every possible variety of attitude. There are those who earnestly desire to retain the office, and are perfectly indifferent on the score of the disabilities; there are others as indifferent about the disabilities, who are eager for the abolition of the office; a third section desire that both should cease to exist; a fourth that both should remain.

For our own part, we should be glad to see England blot out a badge and remnant of a strife long since passed away, in a manner worthy of her best and truest self; in the same generous and lofty spirit as she has revoked the attainders of the temporal peers. Nor can we feel much doubt as to the effect upon the relieved clergy. The Scottish Bishops would be gainers. Their influence would be extended, and that most naturally and legitimately, when they could hold out to those on whom they laid hands the possibility of not being confined to Scotland and the Colonies. And if the offer of a place of influence, of a valuable preferment in England might, now and then, deprive Scotland of a gifted son, yet the loss would, we firmly believe, be more than compensated by the general stimulus given to the

¹ Lectures on Modern History, Lect. V. p. 203.

order. The laity would also be gainers, though in a different way. It has always seemed to us to be a great misfortune to the lairds in Scotland, a real drawback to their spiritual welfare, that they are so very seldom confronted with clergy of their own rank. In this respect, their lot is a great contrast to that of the English squire. We do not, of course, mean (forbid the thought!) that a priest is rendered the less God's commissioned servant by having less of earthly station. But secondary motives do so powerfully intertwine themselves with the life and actions of all but deeply and ardently pious spirits, that it is apt to exercise a very lowering influence on the religion of any class, if they see the service of God's ministry almost constantly dis severed from recognised social station. Now the sort of free commerce, if we may so speak, between the Churches, which the removal of the restrictions would create, might be reasonably expected to raise the *status* of the clergy. Laity might feel and act somewhat differently towards a man of high attainments in Scottish orders, if they knew that his powers were becoming recognised elsewhere, and might lead to his migration southward. They might even occasionally make an effort to keep him.

But the discussion of this subject, in and by itself, has for the present, as we have intimated, become impossible. We pass on, therefore, to the consideration of the Scottish Liturgy. For our own part, earnestly desiring to see that Liturgy still preserved (either unaltered, or not altered for the worse), we must consider three separate classes of persons in connexion with this office, whom we may venture, without offence, to designate, as—1. The opponents; 2. The resigners; 3. The reformers.

1. At the head of the opponents, we must place the respected author of the first pamphlet upon our list. Those who are conscious of the long and unwearied services of the Dean of Edinburgh—who know how fitted he is, in so many ways, for the post he occupies; how well qualified for dealing with those upper classes, among whom no minister of religion in Scotland has so much influence—will gladly recognise his claim to speak on an occasion like the present. And the tone of his pamphlet may, almost without restriction, be safely pronounced to be unexceptionable. Most thoroughly do we agree with the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*, that 'the spirit of the pamphlet must command respect, even where its arguments may fail to convince.'

But as we still remain among the unconvinced, we are bound to give our reasons for dissent. This is a task which must be attempted firmly and fearlessly. At the same time, we earnestly trust that our treatment of the arguments employed by Dean Ramsay may not be such as to militate against aught

that we have said indicative of personal respect. If any word that seems to fail in such respect should fall from our pen, we would apologise for it beforehand; for it is, most assuredly, not intended.

The first point we have to remark upon is this: It not unfrequently happens, that when two parties are contending, there exists in the mind of one of them (perhaps half unconsciously) some hidden *substratum*, so to speak, of a principle which so affects the entire argument as to render the avowed discussion useless. Thus, for example: Two politicians may debate on the much-vexed and really profound question, whether England did well and wisely, or otherwise, in entering upon war against France in 1793? But suppose that we discover, on looking into the arguments employed by one who condemns that war, that he starts, though not explicitly, from the principle that *all* war is wrong and unjustifiable. Obviously, such a one has prejudged the case, and the reasonings of his opponents are simply thrown away upon him. Or, to take an example from another department of thought: The Straussian school of unbelievers very commonly begin their attempt to disprove the historical character of the Holy Gospels by an elaborate disquisition upon the difficulties connected with the genealogies given respectively by S. Matthew and S. Luke. But when a sceptic of this sort is met with the searching arguments of Dr. Mill, or some other like-minded divine, it presently comes to light that his mental position is unchanged; he had already convinced himself that a narrative relating miracles *must* be untrue, whether historically correct or not in other respects. This principle was not, indeed, avowed; but in reality it lay, as a foundation, under the entire superstructure of argument and criticism.

In all such cases, it is most necessary, in the interest of truth and fairness, that the underlying principle be brought before the face of day. Is there any such principle underlying the controversy between the defenders and the opponents of the Scottish Liturgy?

We believe that there is, and that it ought, before all things, to be fairly and frankly brought to trial. The defender of the anti-Gallican war of 1793 has a right to ask his opponent if he belongs to a peace-at-all-price party, before he undertakes to argue. The anti-Straussian has a right to a distinct reply to the query, 'Do you, or do you not, believe in the possibility of miracles? Because, if you do not, it is mere waste of time to discuss Gospel genealogies or various readings.' In like manner, we claim the right, respectfully but firmly, to demand of the opponents of the Scottish Liturgy, '*Do you, or do you*

'not, believe that the Holy Eucharist possesses any sacrificial character?'

Because, if you do not believe it, there is no need whatever to adduce any lengthy train of reasoning against the Scottish Office. In that office, as in the Liturgies of S. Mark, of S. James, of S. Clement—as in the Gallican, the Roman, the American Liturgies—the oblation is prominently brought forward. Of course, if the doctrine of an oblation in this Holy Sacrament be false and unscriptural, the sooner every one of these offices disappears from the face of the earth, the better for the purity of Christian teaching.

It is somewhat singular, that, throughout the twenty-seven pages of the pamphlet before us, there is no mention whatever of such a question; no passing allusion to its existence. If we wish to learn what is held upon so momentous a point by the respected author of this important publication, we are compelled to look for it elsewhere.

But before we seek any solution of the problem what the Dean of Edinburgh may teach upon this subject, it will be well to cite the language of another very influential member of the same communion, the present Bishop of S. Andrews:—'There can be no question whatever that, in all the teaching of the Primitive Church, the notion of a *sacrifice* in the Eucharist holds a very prominent place; and it is equally certain that this notion is truly based upon the authority of Holy Scripture, and upon the practice of the Apostles themselves. It is sufficient to refer to that single passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 10), "We have an *Altar*," &c., with which we may compare the prophecy of Malachi (i. 11), "My Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered in my Name, and a *pure offering*."'¹

Most completely do we assent to the truth and correctness of this statement. The scriptural evidence might of course, as Bishop Wordsworth appears to intimate, be very much enlarged. 'There is,' remarks the late Bishop of Glasgow, Bishop Trower, 'more or less sacrificial language in the expressions used by our blessed Saviour in the institution of the Eucharist.'² And the Apostle, as the same writer observes, 'compares the Eucharist to the sacrifices of the law, and also to the sacrifices of the heathen.' (1 Cor. x. 16—21.)³

But after all, it may be urged, the doctrine seems, upon your own showing, to be an inference from Holy Scripture, rather

¹ A Plain Tract on the Scotch Communion Office: its History, Principles, and Advantages. By Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L., Bishop of S. Andrews, &c. Edinburgh: R. Grant & Son, 1859.

² Pastoral Letter (J. H. Parker), 1858, p. 26.

³ Ibid. p. 24.

than a plain dogmatic statement. True; but we are compelled to ask again, as we have done before in a different connexion, whether an inference from Holy Scripture is a light matter. Do we sufficiently call to mind *to whom* it was said, and *by whom* it was said, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures,' because the persons addressed had failed to perceive the proper inference deducible from certain solemn words recorded by Moses in the Book of Exodus?

Now, unless we misunderstand Dean Ramsay, he would deny the justice of the remarks just cited by us from the writings of these two prelates. We gather thus much from a sermon published by him in 1858.¹ And as, in the preface to the second edition of that sermon, it is expressly stated that the appeal is to be to Holy Scripture only, we wish, before proceeding any further, to enter upon a slight examination of the value of that challenge.

We take up our Bible, and aver most seriously that *we* do read therein (with Bishops Wordsworth and Trower) the doctrine of a sacrificial character pertaining to the Holy Eucharist. To us it seems to be expressed as plainly, to say the very least, as the doctrine of the Personality of the Holy Spirit. Thus, for example, here is a definite prediction made by the prophet Malachi. It must have some meaning. Has it been fulfilled or not?

Now, not pretending to be infallible interpreters of the Bible, we own ourselves compelled in this matter to have recourse to commentators. The Dean of Edinburgh (whom we take as the most influential and argumentative of those opponents of the office who have treated the subject at any length) declares [*the italics are his*] that 'any reliance upon writings of Fathers for 'building up an Eucharistic theory, *external* to Holy Scripture, 'or *independent* of Scripture, must seem a very hopeless task.'² But we are not at present aiming at anything either external to, or independent of, Holy Scripture: we are merely inquiring into the meaning of a particular text, asking whether a given prophecy has been fulfilled or not. And we must simply proceed as we did with respect to this very question some twelve months since. We turn, for example, to the well-known commentary of the Rev. Thomas Scott, and find that he simply passes over the passage *sicco pede*. We betake ourselves to a far more learned commentator, Joseph Mede, and we read as follows:—

'This place of Scripture, howsoever now in a manner silenced and forgotten, was once, and that in the oldest and purest time of the Church, a text of

¹ The Scripture Doctrine of the Eucharist. Edinburgh: Grant & Son, 1858.

² Preface to the second edition of the above sermon.

eminent note, and familiarly known to every Christian, being alleged by their pastors and teachers, as an express and undoubted prophecy of the Christian Sacrifice or solemn worship in the Eucharist, taught by our blessed Saviour unto His disciples, to be observed of all that should believe in His Name: and this so generally and grantedly, as could never have been, at least so early, unless they had learned thus to apply it by tradition from the Apostles. . . . For in the age immediately succeeding them, it being the second hundred of years after Christ, we find it alleged to this purpose by Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the pillars of that age; the former of them flourishing within little more than thirty years after the death of S. John; and the latter a disciple of Polycarp, S. John's scholar. In the age following, or third *seculum*, it is alleged by Tertullian, Zeno Veronensis, and Cyprian; in the fourth *seculum*, by Eusebius, Chrysostom, Hierome, and Augustine; and in the after ages by whom not? Nor is it alleged by them as some singular opinion, or private conceit of their own, but as the received tradition of the Church: whence in some Liturgies (as that of the Church of Alexandria, commonly called the Liturgy of St. Mark) it is inserted into the Hymn, or Preface, which begins 'Αληθώς ἀξιόν ἐστι καὶ δίκαιον—"It is truly meet and right;" the conclusion of the hymn or laud there being, "Giving thanks, we offer unto Thee, O Lord, this reasonable and unbloody service, even that which all nations, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, offer unto Thee; for Thy Name shall be great among all nations: and in every place incense is offered unto Thy Holy Name, and sacrifice and oblation."

Here then is, in our judgment, a primary reason for maintaining the Scottish Liturgy. It may be quite possible that, in some respects, the English Office has the advantage. But forasmuch as the Scotch brings out forcibly a deeply important element which is but faintly visible in the English Liturgy, we hope and trust that so valuable a testimony to a great truth, on the part of a sister communion, may not perish.

Is this language disloyal? If so, the charge must not be made against us peculiarly. It lies against any English divines who, like the saintly Bishop Wilson, have been accustomed to employ private prayers like those contained in the Scotch rite, when they were engaged in the celebration of Holy Communion. It lies against Bishop Horsley, who (in often-quoted words) declared his conviction that the Scotch Office was more conformable to the primitive models, and more edifying, than the English. It lies against Mr. Freeman, who avows that 'the revised Eucharistic Office of the English Church . . . has confessedly laboured under a certain faintness as to the ritual expression of her mind and doctrine. Her real mind in these respects has need to be written yet more legibly.'¹ It lies against the Bishop of S. Andrews, who says of the Scotch Office:—"It follows far more closely the model of the ancient Liturgies. It exhibits far more clearly the first great feature of the Institution, viz. the *act of Sacrifice*."² We need hardly

¹ Principles of Divine Service. Introduct. to Part II. pp. 193, 213.

² Plain Tract, &c. p. 17.

add, that to say that a given document brings out a particular feature into stronger relief than another document, does in nowise imply anything like contradiction between the two. Indeed, it is no more than we affirm respecting the Holy Gospels themselves. Who would deny that the Gospel of S. John sets forth the divinity of our Lord more fully than that of S. Mark? while, at the same time, who (but except some heretic, such as an Arian or Socinian) would maintain that the two Evangelists were at variance?

Any single testimony to a revealed truth is a precious thing, more particularly a testimony embalmed in the highest act of Christian worship. Any single link with distant times and other Churches is likewise very precious. Even Mede was reproved by a still greater theologian than himself—namely, Bishop Pearson—for employing language that seemed likely to endanger the strength of our connexion with primitive times; and we should like, on the present occasion, to ask our readers to peruse with care a brief extract from this *concio* of Pearson, as translated and commented upon by one of the very first divines of our own age, the late lamented Dr. Mill, in a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge:—

‘Let us not consider it a slight matter which is thus proposed for our choice; and let us particularly not think it a point of small moment, even for our spiritual condition, being intelligent men and scholars, whether we are among those who reverence, or among those who vilify the Church of Apostolical times; for to these, and to no later ones, are those ideas and practices clearly traced, which are now marked for abhorrence and rejection. And I would prefer, finally, expressing this in the words, only recently discovered, of a great prelate of our Church, one whom it has not yet become usual in this University, which he adorned, to consider as a favourer of Roman views and practices. Speaking in a learned language to the clergy, of certain interpretations of prophecy then put forth, and now again proposed with greater pertinacity than ever, he says in conclusion:—“This I say, that we should not think so ill of the promise of Jesus Christ, so ill of the men of Apostolic times, without whom we should not have the benefit even of the Holy Scriptures, and of all the other heroes of the primitive Church—as to preach a general apostasy of the Church, so disgraceful, so idolatrous: which, if it be true, infected and defiled all the assemblies of Christians, not only from the dissolution of the Roman Empire, but from the very infancy of the Church. For if we cut off all intercession of angels and saints for us living on earth, and striving with the host of evil spirits—if we acknowledge no power at all before the throne of God, of the martyrs who poured forth their lives for Christ—if all those who venerated their remains are by us rejected, scouted, and branded as idolaters . . . what that Church may be with which we can hold communion I am altogether ignorant. I know, indeed, what, among the men of these degenerate times, is the face of the Churches, and what a spirit is stirred in all, when the seamless coat of Christ has been rent asunder. But when we have discussed and ventilated all points, to those times we must have recourse—to those, I say, which knew the Apostles and the disciples of Apostles—which not only professed the Christian religion, but extended it both by purity of life and by the shedding of blood. . . . If that religion which sent the best part of the world under the yoke of Christ

was itself apostatical and idolatrous, where shall that appear which is Christian, catholic, and apostolical ?

'So far Bishop Pearson (whose words, though primarily directed against the censors of the Church's veneration for departed saints, *are no less conclusive against those who decry her Eucharistic Sacrifice*). May we, like him, have our fellowship with those to whom the Apostles communicated what they had heard and seen, well assured that this is the true fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.'¹

Sit anima mea cum sanctis is, indeed, a most natural, as well hallowed, aspiration. It is possible to take part, even indirectly, in the abolition of what may prove to have been a providential witness to truth, without running the chance of aiding the spread of sentiments of a very different nature? May it not be found that those who prepare for battle against the doctrine of any sacrifice on the altar are unconsciously forging weapons against the doctrine of the Sacrifice upon the Cross?

To come forward and avow that this office ought to be abolished, because it involves the doctrine of an external oblation in the Eucharist, is, without doubt, a straightforward and intelligible course. But the adoption of such a course would involve the rejection and overthrow of the great bulk, not merely of Scottish, but likewise of English, theology.

The eminent person whose course of argument we mainly follow refers, in his recent pamphlet, to only three divines who have written upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist; namely, Hooker, Waterland, and Jeremy Taylor. The mistakes into which Hooker fell, in ignoring the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist, have been pointed out by Mr. Freeman; and his language had been censured at an earlier period (if we remember aright) by Waterland. Waterland himself is called by the Dean of Chichester, Dr. Hook, 'a judicious divine, who 'has treated fully of this divine ordinance, and has taken of it, *'perhaps, the lowest view which is consistent with orthodoxy.'*' Yet even Waterland declares, 'that the Sacrament of the 'Eucharist, in whole or in part, in a sense proper or improper, 'is a sacrifice of the Christian Church, is a point agreed upon 'among all knowing and sober divines, Popish, Lutheran, or 'Reformed.'² Of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, it must be admitted that he is a very inconsistent writer. But if we may, with Dean Ellicott, of Exeter, look upon Taylor's 'Life of Christ' as his greatest work; if, as we believe, his innermost self comes

¹ Mill on the 'Nature of Christianity,' Serm. i. pp. 51—53. The words of Pearson are from his fourth *Concio ad Clerum*. Minor works; Ed. Charton, tom. ii. p. 54.

² The Eucharist a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. A Sermon preached at Birch Church, on the 5th of July, 1846. London: Rivingtons, 1847.

³ Cited by Dr. Hook in the above sermon, p. 13.

out more strongly in these devotional than in his controversial writings, then it must be said that Taylor has employed in 'his greatest work' the strongest language respecting the Eucharistic Sacrifice of any English divine, stronger than that of Hammond, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Bull, Poynet, Hickes, John Johnson, and the other supporters of the doctrine. Most remarkable is it, as an indication of Bishop Taylor's truest mind, that when Parliament, during the Rebellion, forbade the use of the English Prayer-Book, Taylor drew up a Liturgy which brought out, in explicit form, the doctrine of the Sacrifice.

And now we come to a topic which demands, in the present day, very earnest and peculiar consideration. And if these pages should chance to meet the eye of any who differ from our views, we would respectfully beg their attention to this particular subject, even if they read no other portion of this article.

The existence of a sacrificial element in the Holy Eucharist either is a revealed truth or it is not. If we assert that it is not, then we condemn ancient fathers, ancient Liturgies, and the great body of Anglican divines, both in England and Scotland, who have asserted that it is. But if it *be* a revealed truth, then it is highly probable that, over and above its own special worth, it may fill some particular place in the economy of the faith, in such wise that its denial may endanger our grasp of other truths. One truth is very often the safeguard of another. For example, the ministry of angels is in itself a revelation eminently sublime, elevating, and consoling; but besides its intrinsic value, it is one of the greatest possible safeguards against the danger of Pantheism. He who has realized to himself the nature of the offices intrusted to S. Michael and S. Gabriel, is not likely to fall into the heresy of regarding their Lord and Creator as a mere abstraction, an impersonal *anima mundi*, working by laws over which He has no control.

Now, the assault of rationalism in our day is directed against the doctrine of the Atonement of the Sacrifice on the Cross. May it not prove, as this controversy with rationalism proceeds, that the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Altar is the appointed safeguard of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Cross? We submit this question to the earnest consideration of thoughtful men, and proceed to supply a few aids towards the formation of an opinion respecting it.

The author of a widely-circulated edition of the Greek Testament, Dean Alford, appears to us to take very special pains to ignore or evade the natural inference in favour of the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist, deducible from such passages

as 1 Cor. x. 16—21: and the fact that such a doctrine was embodied in every one of the ancient Liturgies, without exception, would be probably treated by the same commentator as a matter of the slightest possible moment. True; but then it must be remembered that Canon Stanley¹ claims Dean Alford as a witness in favour of that very imperfect view (to use the mildest language) of the Atonement which has been promulgated by Professor Jowett.

Dr. Arnold, relying upon classic usage (a most insufficient guide to the meaning of Hellenistic Greek), expressed the greatest contempt for the argument for a sacrificial element in the Holy Eucharist derived from the use of the term *ποιεῖν* by S. Luke and S. Paul.² Yes; but then Dr. Arnold expressed contempt for a good many things besides. He rejected a great part of the Book of Daniel; he told Mr. F. Newman that he regarded the history of Joseph as a beautiful poem; and his view of the Holy Communion was such as to justify his son, in the tale of 'Oakfield,' representing two young laymen as doing well to partake of that most sacred rite without the aid or presence of any priest whatever.

Dr. Mill has left us a work which, though unfinished, is probably the most profound and learned reply to Strauss which exists in any language. True; but we have seen in the passage already cited how firmly Dr. Mill upheld the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Of all the Lutheran theologians of our time, none has more energetically, or in a more pious and reverent spirit, contended against neology than Hengstenberg. True; but then Hengstenberg is one of the leaders of a movement among German Protestants which aims at restoring the Holy Communion to its ancient place, as the main part and centre of Divine Service, and bringing prominently forward its sacrificial character. This movement is supported by the illustrious names of Kahnis, Kliefoth, Höfling, Sartorius, Harnack, Löhe, Buchmann, and others. High as was the view of Martin Luther respecting the supernatural and supra-local presence of Christ's body in this His chief sacrament, these Lutheran divines just named appear to go higher still. What would they not give to have an office

¹ Note appended to 'Freedom and Labour.' Two Sermons. (J. H. and Jas. Parker, 1860.) We do not pretend to decide upon the justice or injustice of Dr. Stanley's claim.

² S. Luke xxix. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24. Not only does *ποιεῖν* mean, *to sacrifice*, in more than thirty places of the Septuagint, but it seems natural sense in S. Matt. xxvi. 18.—'I will offer the passover at thy house with my disciples.' The expression, 'eat the passover,' in the parallel passages of S. Mark and S. Luke, in no wise militates against this interpretation, inasmuch as the partaking is an essential part of all true and legitimate sacrifice.

like the Scottish! How would they cling to it if it were once in their possession!

More than twenty years since an author of considerable name wrote as follows:—‘But as that deliverance [of Israel from Egypt] was accompanied with a sacrificial act, and by a sacrificial act accomplished—and yet in this Passover the act was perpetually renewed—because in this way the nation understood that by sacrifice it subsisted and consisted, and because by such a renewal its members realized the permanent and living character of the good that had been bestowed upon them, so it is here. The sacrifice of Christ is that with which alone God can be satisfied, and in the sight of which alone He can contemplate our race; it is, therefore, the only meeting point of communion with Him: but this communion being established, it must be *by presenting the finished sacrifice before God that we both bear witness what our position is, and realize the glory of it.*’¹

The present Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Thomson, is one of the most distinguished defenders of the sacrificial character of the one great Atonement, that can never be repeated, once for all made upon the cross. It is highly significant that, in his excellent essay upon the ‘Death of Christ,’ Bishop Thomson is led to appeal to the history of the institution of the Holy Eucharist as a proof of the sacrifice involved in our Lord’s death. ‘It cannot be denied (we might almost say that, before Mr. Jowett, it never was denied) that the words of the institution ‘of the Lord’s Supper speak most distinctly of a sacrifice.’ Another writer, Mr. Heygate, seems to us to have been only drawing out, by anticipation, the natural conclusion deducible from Dr. Thomson’s arguments, when he wrote the chapter in his ‘Catholic Antidotes,’ entitled, ‘The Eucharistic Sacrifice the Appointed Witness of the Atonement.’

The first signal of a serious attack upon the doctrine of the Atonement by any divine of the English Church was given by Professor Jowett, in his essay upon the subject. It is by no means easy to catch the precise purport of a writer so misty, and so unversed in the use of theological terms, as the Professor of Greek at Oxford. But there did *seem* to be contained in the first edition of that essay a hint that it was consistent enough in one who held and taught the doctrine of a Sacrifice in the Eucharist, to proclaim at the same time the Sacrifice upon the Cross; but that it was *not* consistent to drop all

¹ Kingdom of Christ; part ii. chap. iv. sec. 4. Even so lately as last year, Mr. Maurice has spoken of the connexion between the Eucharist and the Atonement in terms not discordant with the above passage.

mention of the former, and still ask for credence in the latter. This passage has, we believe, been withdrawn from the second edition of Mr. Jowett's work on the Epistles. But a hint, once given, is often valuable. In the present instance, we feel deeply grateful for a suggestion which we cannot but suspect to contain the germ of a deep truth; and we commend it to thoughtful meditation, on the part of those who reflect at all upon such subjects.

The Episcopal Church in Scotland and the Episcopal Church in America may have respectively their own faults and shortcomings; but neither of these communions has ever yet been charged with fostering rationalism within their pale, as it may now, alas! be charged against the Church of England. Now, the Scottish Church, and its daughter the American Church, have both retained in their Liturgies a distinct oblation; but the English Church has not retained it.

The publication of 'Essays and Reviews' has produced a very considerable effect upon the minds of many earnest members of what is commonly called the Evangelical party. The excellent persons to whom we refer have been much struck with two things—Firstly, the appearance of such a book has convinced them that there are worse things in the world than Tractarianism; and, secondly, they have frankly admitted that writers more or less connected with the High-Church school have done prompt and vigorous service against the obnoxious teaching. Our contemporary, the *Record*, if we remember rightly, most cordially recognised the merit of Dr. Pusey's letter concerning 'Essays and Reviews' in the *Guardian*; Dr. Moberly's championship in the cause was gladly welcomed; and a reprint from the pages of this Review received, perhaps, higher praise from the *St. James's Chronicle* than from any quarter. Is it too much to hope for a still more complete *rapprochement*? May not, at least, the *sons* of some who are now eager for the abolition of the office of which we are treating live to thank those who contended for it; and the *Future of the Scottish Liturgy* be its recognition, not merely as a link with the past, but also as a most valuable safeguard against the special dangers of the coming age?

Conscientiously believing that the Scotch Office may prove to be all this, we need hardly say that we are not in a position to listen with thoroughly consentient ears to appeals made in the interest of peace and unity, such as stand upon the dedication page, and confront us again in the latest page of this pamphlet. Not, we trust, that we are insensible to the value of these great and signal blessings. No, indeed; far from it: they carry with them their own recommendation; they are stamped

with the approval of Him who bequeathed to His chosen ones a peace that is not of earth, who prayed for all who should believe in Him, that they might be one. But these gifts, precious as they are, do not and cannot stand alone. The Divine Founder of the Church, the Prince of peace, and Father of union, announced Himself likewise as the Truth; declared most emphatically that He was born and came into the world that He might bear witness unto the truth. And in this spirit does our Church pray, 'that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into *the way of truth*, and 'hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in 'righteousness of life;' or, again, 'that all they that do confess 'Thy holy Name may agree *in the truth* of Thy holy Word, and 'live in unity and godly love.' Both in her daily prayer and in her Communion Office, is the self-same order preserved: *truth* first, unity and peace afterwards. Now, if the Scottish Liturgy bear witness to a neglected truth, of especial moment at this time, those who would fain save that office from abolition may fairly claim to stand upon considerations which take precedence even of desires for peace and love.

We have observed that the pamphlet before us does not contain a single syllable on the important topic to which we have been mainly referring in the last ten pages. But while we think it most necessary to discuss that subject, from a conviction that it underlies the entire controversy, it would be unfair in us to pass by the serious objection to the office which Dean Ramsay has embodied in his pamphlet.

His objection is, that the Scottish Liturgy, in company with that of S. James, S. Mark, S. Clement, and S. Chrysostom, is, in one respect, simply *unscriptural*. It is difficult, assuredly, to overrate either the boldness or the seriousness of such a charge. In avowing it, we believe that the Dean of Edinburgh stands absolutely alone and unsupported by any single great divine of the primitive Church, of the English Church, of the Eastern Churches. Nor do we for a moment imagine that his view would be countenanced by any of the better anti-rationalistic Lutheran divines, such as Kahnis or Hengstenberg. From one quarter, and one only, is he likely to gain support; and that is from a second-rate class of Roman Catholic divines, such as Turrecremata. Under these circumstances, we cannot be surprised at the following remarks of the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*:—

'If there is one thing in it which we regret, it is that the Dean has gone into the question as to the doctrinal merits of the Scottish Office, and by making a comparison between it and the English Office, to the disparagement of the

former, has thereby, we are apprehensive, weakened the cause he has taken in hand. There is, at the present moment, many a Scottish priest willing to surrender the Scottish Office, on the ground that it is inexpedient to retain it, in the face of the difficulties created by its use under the constant and increasing intercourse between England and Scotland, who would rather face those difficulties multiplied a hundred-fold, than consent to abandon the Office on the plea that it was one whit less Scriptural than the English.'

The appeal of the Dean of Edinburgh is to Holy Scripture. Thus far, of course, he does *not* stand alone. We will just refer to one other writer who appeals to the same standard. No one has done this in a more marked manner than that very distinguished liturgical scholar, Mr. W. Palmer:—'*Guided by Scripture, she [the Church] establishes only those truths which Scripture reveals, and leaves the subject in that mystery with which God, for His wise purposes, has invested it.*'¹ Such is Mr. Palmer's language, and no liturgist has more ably or zealously defended the Communion Office of the English Church. And what is the judgment of this student of Scripture and the Liturgies respecting that invocation of the Holy Spirit which Dean Ramsay thinks so unscriptural? '*No one,*' says Mr. Palmer, '*can pretend to deny that it is perfectly orthodox, and highly laudable.*'²

S. Matthew and S. Mark both inform us that our Lord blessed the bread (*εὐλογῆσας*). S. Luke and S. Paul employ a different, and, perhaps, even more emphatic, term (*εὐχαριστήσας*). We say more emphatic, for few will be found to maintain that the 'giving thanks' of our authorized version conveys the full force of this term. In any case, it cannot be considered to mean less, for all four of the inspired writers apply this latter term to the cup; and no one, that we ever heard of, ever pretended that the blessing imparted to the one element in any wise fell short of that imparted to the other. The reason for the variety of the expressions (as Canon Wordsworth very justly remarks on S. Matth. xxvi. 28) 'seems to be, that He 'designed to afford the *full* sense of the words by paraphrasing 'them in different ways.' And far as we are from accepting Dean Alford as a guide in these questions, we have no difference with him when, in his note upon this same passage, he writes: '*εὐλογῆσας* and *εὐχαριστήσας* amount to the same 'in practice. . . . *εὐλογῆσας* must be construed transitively—'*ἄρτον* is governed by all four verbs, *λαβὼν, εὐλογῆσας, ἔκλασε, ἔδιδου*. From this *giving of thanks for, and blessing the* 'offering, the Holy Communion has been from the earliest 'times also called *εὐχαριστία*.' [Italics as in original.] For proof of the active force of *εὐλογέω*, Dr. Alford rightly refers

¹ Treatise on the Church, vol. ii.

² Ancient Liturgies, vol. ii.

to a passage in many ways important, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (x. 16), 'The cup of blessing which we bless,' &c.

It is part of the immeasurable depth and fulness of Holy Writ, that even single words very frequently imply some important principle; nay, even a whole system of doctrine or of practice. Such terms as *Only-begotten*, *repentance*, *justified*, *proceeding from*, *enlightened*, and numbers more, are well-nigh a theology in themselves. And thus, in the instance before us, the Church throughout the world has understood the expressions, *εὐλογίας*, *εὐχαριστίας*, to involve the idea of a prayer of blessing on the elements. Almost everywhere does it seem to have been held of old, that the mere recitation of our Lord's solemn words of institution is insufficient without some such prayer. Even Presbyterianism has recognised thus much:—
'The Directory for the worship of God in the Established Church of Scotland directs, that the minister shall earnestly pray to God, the Father of all mercies, to vouchsafe His gracious presence and the effectual working of His Spirit in us, and so to sanctify these elements of bread and wine, and bless His own ordinance, that we may receive by faith the body and blood of Jesus Christ crucified for us.'¹ The English Church has such a prayer in the words immediately preceding the rite of institution—'Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood.'

Now, how is all this profound question of the *blessing* (a feature declared by many sound theologians to be *essential* to the sacred Office) treated in the pamphlet before us? In no spirit of invidiousness or of disrespect, but simply that we may look the matter fairly in the face, it will be well to place the passage from the Epistle to the Corinthians, which Dean Ramsay cites, side by side with his paraphrase of it:—

1 Cor. xi. 23—25.

'For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread: and when He had given thanks, He

Paraphrase by the Dean of Edinburgh.

'In other words, St. Paul, as a minister of Jesus Christ, was directed to do as Jesus had done, the night in which He was betrayed—viz. to break the bread and take the cup, and at

¹ A friend in Scotland, writing to us, called our attention to this order of the Presbyterian Directory. Since this letter reached us, we observe that the order has been used in a 'Northern Layman's Plea' (a very excellent one) for the Office in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* for last April. Not having the Directory at hand, we have borrowed from this last-named letter.

brake it and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.'

once deliver it to the communicants: nay, the two acts seem to go together. He broke the bread, and said, "Take, eat;" He took the cup, saying, "This cup is the new testament." [Italics as in original.]

This is surely, for one who refers to Holy Scripture only, a very daring paraphrase. It omits what the Apostle does say; it inserts that which he does not say. It omits all allusion to the term *εὐχαριστήσας*, on the full sense and import of which the question between us mainly hinges, and it inserts, in italics, the words *at once*, which form no part whatever of the inspired record. The omission we would venture to supply by paraphrasing this word *εὐχαριστήσας* into *having uttered a prayer of benediction*; that is to say, having done what is done in the *English* Office, but more emphatically and distinctly in the *Scottish*. The Dean of Edinburgh *appears* to think this portion of the service of little or no moment. In such a view, he has with him some of the schoolmen and later Roman Catholic divines. But the prince of the schoolmen, Aquinas, is against him; and we believe that the other theory of consecration is of late date, and not easily reconciled with the tenor of Holy Scripture, any more than it is with the language of the early Fathers and the Liturgies.

And now to come to the insertion *at once*. We have already admitted the lawfulness of inference from Holy Scripture. But it must be remarked, that of all inferences chronological ones are often the most delicate and difficult, and the very last on which a cautious student of Scripture would wish to dogmatize. Nothing is more clear than that the holy Evangelists, in many instances, present us with a mere sketch and outline of what occurred, and that the *primâ facie* inference of an immediate sequence would again and again be utterly incorrect. To refer to only the latter events of 'the Life that was manifested.' Who could possibly gather from the first three Gospels that any important event tending to hasten the consummation had occurred before the last journey to Jerusalem? But the sequence of the events narrated by S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke, is *not* continuous: one does not follow *at once* upon the other; there intervened the wonderful recalling to life of Lazarus, an event not only important as one of our Lord's very greatest miracles, but most closely interwoven with the entire framework of the plots against His life. Again, who would doubt, in reading S. Matthew xxvi. 29, 30, with the parallel passages in S. Mark and

S. Luke, that the singing of the hymn and departure to the Mount of Olives followed *at once* upon the conclusion of the new and solemn ordinance. Yet so far is this from being the case, that the discourse then uttered by our Lord is sufficient to occupy no less than four chapters, or nearly a sixth part of S. John's Gospel. If the Dean of Edinburgh is justified in dogmatically asserting that there was no interval whatever between the consecration and the delivery of the consecrated elements to the communicants, others may as dogmatically assert that the whole action was continuous, that there was no interval between the consecration of the bread and that of the cup. Now, we certainly feel inclined to agree with those who believe that the whole of that sacred action *was* continuous. But even here we are forced to pause and consider the danger of being too confident in our chronological inferences. Before we unhesitatingly assert that the consecration and delivery of the chalice followed *at once* upon that of the prior substance, we have to consider that one of the profoundest students of Scripture of our time, Mr. Greswell, thinks otherwise, and that Aquinas has anticipated Mr. Greswell in taking this view.

But let us, for argument's sake, assume that Dean Ramsay's inference is perfectly correct. Even then, we maintain that his argument would prove too much. If the Church is tied down to a rigid and exact uniformity of order, according to the arrangement which seems to be set forth in *the letter* of the Gospels and the First Epistle to the Corinthians, then that order stands as follows:—

1. Prayer of thanks and blessing on the bread (*εὐλογήσας, εὐχαριστήσας*).
2. Breaking of the same (*ἔκλασε*).
3. Delivery (*ἔδιδου, ἔδωκεν*) to the communicants.
4. Words of institution for prior part of the rite (recorded in all four narratives).
5. Additional words indicating a commemorative and (apparently) sacrificial character (S. Luke and S. Paul).

Then, either immediately, or (as some think) after an interval:¹—

6. Prayer of thanks and blessing on the cup.
7. Delivery of the same.
8. Words of institution (recorded in all four accounts).

¹ As we have just remarked, Aquinas, Mr. Williams, Mr. Greswell, and others, believe in the intervention of certain acts and words between the two parts. Mr. Greswell inserts S. Mark xxvi. 21—25; S. Mark xiv. 18—21; S. Luke xxii. 21—23; S. John xiii. 18—38; and S. Luke xxii. 24—38. Powerful and ingenious arguments for unbroken sequence are employed by Estius and others.

9. Additional words resembling those applied to the prior part (S. Paul only).

We are quite unable to see how any Church in Christendom can be justified in attacking the arrangement of the Scottish and the Oriental Churches as unscriptural, without at the same time condemning itself. If the Church of Rome and the Church of England may with propriety (which we do not for a moment doubt) consecrate, by prayer and the recital of the words of institution, both elements *before* either the celebrant or the people partake, how can they, with any show of justice or of charity, blame those who place the prayer for a blessing after the recital of the words of institution. The Western arrangement, as such, may be preferable; our own judgment would be, with diffidence, in its favour. But this question of order seems to us a fairly open one; and *both* the Eastern and the Western Churches are unscriptural, or else neither.

In his pamphlet on the 'Present State of our Canon Law considered,' the Dean lays so much stress on the exactitude of sequence, as to intimate that *any* prayer, between the words of institution and delivery of that spiritual food to the communicants, is incorrect. This is saying, in other words, that there is no correct liturgy in all Christendom, saving and except the English. All the rest, American, Oriental, Roman, Scottish, are *so far* wrong, as every one of them have some prayer between. Surely this is the very height of intolerance.

But we are unable, for our own part, to see how the matter can rest there. If the Churches of different countries have no right to insert anything in one part of their liturgies, except what they find visibly and precisely laid down in Holy Scripture, what right have they to make insertions elsewhere? If they are rigidly bound to the letter of the Biblical narrative, this rule must not be employed as a Lesbian one, and only made to fit in parts. We must test the entire service by it; and what is in this case to become of the service? Take the English Office. The commandments must, of course, disappear. There is not the shadow of evidence that they formed any part of the primal Eucharist. Then, supposing that on general grounds we can account for the two next prayers, the Epistle and Gospel must be necessarily withdrawn; for as they were not in existence, they can have no possible warrant from the inspired records, as a part of the sacred Office. The Nicene Creed must, of course, follow; and, indeed, we hardly know what would remain.

The precise relation of the invocation to the words of institution is a point on which it must be frankly owned there are

two schools among the defenders of the Scottish and Oriental Liturgies. This is, however, no more than can be asserted with equal truth respecting the Roman Liturgy and the English Liturgy. It certainly cannot be on the grounds of perfect conformity among its advocates that the English Office can lay claim to supplant the Scottish. Our own view of the relation of the two parts of the Office, just referred to, would incline to the teaching of those who regard the words of institution, the oblation, and the invocation, as one great action, only carried on in consecutive portions, just because man is *compelled* to act *in time*; whereas God, the Holy Trinity, whose agency is thus sought, transcends all bounds of time, as well as of space, and can effect that at once which we mortals are obliged to ask for step by step.

The Dean of Edinburgh, however, appears to have a certain amount of objection to the appeal thus made to the third person of the Holy Trinity, seeing that the Sacrament itself is so especially that of the Son. His other objections may be more or less surprising; this one is simply astounding. We should have thought that if there was one truth more patent than another on the very surface of the New Testament, it was the wonderful intertwining (if we may use the term without irreverence) of the work of the Holy Spirit with that of the Son. Thus, for example, we know that the Son condescended to make Himself of no reputation, to take the form of a servant, and to be born of the Virgin Mary; He stooped to be baptized by his own humble forerunner; He willed to go into the wilderness and be tempted of the devil; He went about, of His own free choice, preaching the Gospel and working miracles; He offered Himself a spotless sacrifice upon the cross. It will scarcely, we presume, be disputed that the above statements are Scriptural. And yet each one of them is, by itself, the enunciation of only partial truth. That He may be born of the Virgin Mary, it is needed in the Divine economy that He should first be conceived of the Holy Ghost; when the Baptist pours on His brow the waters of Jordan, it is the Spirit of God who descends like a dove upon the Son; He goes up to the wilderness to be tempted, but He is led thither by the Spirit; the claim to proceed upon His work of healing body and soul is grounded on the fact, that the Spirit of the Lord is upon Him; and when He consummated His meritorious work upon Mount Calvary, He, '*through the eternal Spirit*, offered Himself without spot to God.' We cannot so much as mention the name of the Messiah, the Christ, without, by implication, referring to the work of the Spirit. For what do these words mean, but the Anointed? And 'the Spirit of the Lord hath anointed Me:

He was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power.' It is in accordance with the whole analogy of Scripture, in the highest degree probable, that when our Lord blessed His creatures of bread and wine, He *did* specially invoke the Holy Spirit. Of course, we entirely agree with Mr. Palmer, that such express mention of the third person of the Holy Trinity is not essential. But so far as we know, it has been reserved for a divine of the nineteenth century to make the first attack upon this particular feature of the Eastern Liturgies; and we really trust that this first attack will also be the last. That the 'invocation should *supersede* the consecration,' to use the words of this pamphlet, is impossible, and was never imagined.¹

Are Dean Ramsay's objections to the Scottish Office finished? Alas! no; there remains one more, which lies still deeper than any of those that have preceded. It must be stated in his own words —

'Surely bread and wine can only be called the Body and Blood of Christ in their relation to the communicants? Many persons do really consider it a somewhat dangerous assimilation to the doctrine of transubstantiation to pray that the bread and wine may become *in themselves* and *per se* the Body and Blood of Christ. We can never hold them, in a sense purely subjective, to have that character.'

The concluding sentence, construed *ad literam*, might somewhat perplex us. But its meaning, when it is taken with the context, is sufficiently clear. Either for *subjective* we must read *objective*, or else we must insert the words 'otherwise than' before 'purely subjective.' The former emendation is the less harsh and the one that we may venture to adopt.

Is it, then, disrespectful, is it uncharitable, to understand the drift of the pamphlet before us to be as follows:—The 'Scripture doctrine of the Holy Eucharist' was set forth in a sermon preached in S. John's Church, Edinburgh, on January 10th, 1856, and seems to contain the key-note to the Dean's views of exhaustive truth, and of his desire for the abolition of the Scottish Office.

Now if the teaching of that sermon be not merely tolerable (being, as it is, most decidedly above that of the Zuinglian school), but likewise the only one that is to *be* tolerated, then indeed

¹ 'The sense of the Oriental Church may be thus expressed: the bread and wine offered on the altar are transmuted into the Body and Blood of Christ by the words of institution *and* by the invocation by the Church of the Holy Ghost.' These words of Dr. Neale have been approved of by some of the highest authorities in the Russian Church. We quote them from his 'Earnest Plea for the Retention of the Scotch Liturgy.' It is right to say, that this powerful pamphlet has only just reached us. Consequently, any agreement between us and this eminent liturgical scholar is a really independent coincidence of thought.

is the desired conclusion quite irrefragable. But if anything higher than the view invented by Calvin¹ be tolerable, then the argument implied in this pamphlet seems to us to suggest one of the strongest possible reasons for the retention of the Scottish Office.

Should that Office be withdrawn, upon such grounds, it must, we conceive, imply a censure on the whole of the existing Scottish Bench. Directly or indirectly, the Bishops in Scotland have all sanctioned language which we cannot but think to be much more consonant to the Scottish Office than to that of Dean Ramsay's sermon. That language we subjoin in a note;² and meanwhile, on the subject of the Invocation, would quote the following remarks of the Bishop of S. Andrews:—

'But how, then, you may ask, are the words of this prayer to be explained? I answer, simply by a reference to our blessed Lord's own words. We pray that the Bread and Wine may "become," that is, *come to be*, what He Himself, in the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, said they *are*, viz. HIS BODY AND BLOOD. Surely, there can be nothing wrong in this. We all know that the Eucharist is a great *Sacrament* or *mystery*—that is, something altogether beyond our comprehension; and surely, in such a case, the very best and safest thing we can do, especially when we are at the height of the mystery—that is, in the act of consecration—I say the very best and safest thing we can do, is to keep as close as we can to our Lord's own words. How these words are to be understood is another matter, which applies to the interpretation of them where they occur in the Holy Gospels, exactly in the same manner and degree as it does to our Communion Office; and a person who is offended by them, or wishes to get rid of them out of our Communion Office, might with just as much reason object to them, and wish to get rid of them out of the New Testament: and you will remember what our blessed Lord says of such a wish: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and of My words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when He cometh in the glory of His Father with the holy angels."—*Plain Tract*, p. 15.

If we knew of any production against the Office which had equal weight and importance with that of Dean Ramsay, we would have given it as prominent a position. Thus far we have only paid attention to the arguments adduced against the unscriptural character of the office; and we ask our readers, with their Bibles before them, to consider whether it is the Scottish Liturgy, or the objections to it, which are unscriptural. Is it unscriptural to recognise a sacrificial character in the Holy Eucharist? Is it unscriptural to believe that every single word employed in the narrative of so great an event should

¹ 'That doctrine, however Christian a face it may wear, was simply invented by Calvin three hundred years ago.'—Freeman's 'Principles of Divine Service,' Introduction to Part II. p. 201.

² 'Instructed by Scripture and the Formularies of the Church, you will continue to teach that the consecrated elements of Bread and Wine become, in a mystery, the Body and Blood of Christ.'—Pastoral, signed by the Primus and five other Scottish Bishops, issued in May, 1858.

have due weight accorded to it? Is it unscriptural, and against the analogy of the faith, to believe that as the Holy Spirit was specially concerned in the Incarnation of the Son, even so, too, He may be specially concerned in bringing about the mystical presence of His body and blood? Is it unscriptural to believe that when the Apostle spoke of 'not discerning (*μὴ διακρίναν*) the Lord's body,' immediately after his account of the institution, he implied that It was, in some sense, objectively present, though the unworthy recipient might not be conscious of Its presence?

If all these questions are to be answered in the affirmative, then in a greater or less degree must be pronounced, at the same time, the condemnation of the Eastern, the American, and the Scottish Churches, for daring to employ liturgies which imply, with greater or less distinctness, replies in the negative.

But we, for our part, we hope reverently and in the fear of God, refuse to take part in any such proceeding.

II. Nothing that has thus far been said will, we presume, be thought to be alien from the province of a Review which undertakes to discuss theological and quasi-theological subjects, in connexion, not only with England, but with America, France, Ireland, Scotland, and Italy. But we have now arrived at that portion of our discussion which is more delicate, inasmuch as it may subject us to the charge of offering most unasked-for advice. Yet let it be remembered that no one is compelled to read what is here set down. Moreover, from more than one quarter, we have heard hopes expressed that so grave a question should find its place in our July number. And if our remarks should prove distasteful to many of whose approbation should be glad, it may well be doubted whether total silence would not be equally displeasing to a large proportion of Scottish Churchmen. They would not be pleased to see that matters, of which *they* think much, were totally uncared-for by the rest of Britain. The speech of Sir Geraint in 'Enid' is hardly courteous, even in cases where it is true:

'Ye think the rustic cackle of your bourg
The murmur of the world! What is it to me?'

And *Edimbourg*, as the French call it, is not a rustic bourg; and there are others besides Scotchmen-born, who take interest in this or that feature of the varied life of the place. Some of those, who will perhaps blame us for interference, may themselves have had the opportunity of uttering their sentiments in Diocesan Synods, or will have such an opening in the forthcoming General Synod. But we, who have enjoyed

no such privilege, may be pardoned for thus conveying our opinions to such as care to know them. We are now concerned with those whom we have ventured to call Resigners; that is to say, those who, while assuring us that they do not object to the Scottish Liturgy, are yet prepared to vote for alterations in the Scottish Canons which are intended to eradicate it in a few years.

We begin with some general considerations. Let it be observed, that if there exist in the world of action at the present moment one sentiment more active and pervading than another, it is *the dread of mere majorities, as such*. We say *mere majorities*; for, of course, we do not intend anything so absurd as that majorities are not very often entirely in the right. But in such cases it will be found, for the most part, that they are not simply majorities of numbers, but contain in them elements of another character which give character and authority to their decisions.

In 1844, the late Mr. Daniel O'Connell was tried for sedition and convicted. A question, however, was reserved for the decision of the English judges touching the conformity to the letter of the law of the procedure connected with handing to the accused the list of witnesses. The judges divided; nine were in favour of the legality of the proceedings, six were against it. Why did barristers shake their heads and hint doubts as to the ultimate confirmation of what had been done? Because, although there was a majority half as large again as the minority, that minority comprised the name of Mr. Baron Parke, since raised to the peerage as Lord Wensleydale. The final appeal lay to the House of Lords; the Government (Sir Robert Peel was Premier) could easily have mustered supporters enough to confirm the view taken by the nine judges. But they shrank on a point of such nicety from trusting to a *mere majority*. At the request of the President of the Council, the matter was left entirely to the very small body of Law Lords. The opinion of the minority of the judges was adopted, and Mr. O'Connell was released from prison.

Some ten years pass away, and the question of a Reform in Parliament is again mooted. Successive Governments, those headed respectively by Lord Aberdeen, Lord Derby, Lord Palmerston, all bring forward measures of their own. One of those bills, that of Earl Russell (as we must now call him), had a special provision intended to give some *protection and influence to minorities*. And at the moment when we are writing, a thoughtful supporter of the same principle, Mr. Hare, has been explaining to the Social Science Congress that his plan for giving weight to minorities has been received with favour

in many places; even, for instance, in Geneva—a city which, though once oligarchical, has been for the last eighteen years exceedingly democratic. However, all these Reform Bills failed. And why? From sheer alarm at the possibility of their throwing the main power of the State into the hands of a merely numerical majority.

Let us direct our gaze across the Atlantic. Ask the more refined and cultivated denizens of New York, how they reconciled it to their consciences to stand so completely aloof from all political struggles for so many years before the great disruption. They will answer, that they found the attempt to gain any weight in the management of affairs quite useless. Wealth, education, descent, all are swallowed up and overwhelmed by actual numbers; unless, indeed, the wealth be employed in the shape of wholesale bribery. There are those in New York, who go so far as to palliate this last-named way of proceeding as the least of two evils. That the rule of a mere majority might prove (despite many checks provided against it in the United States' Constitution) a very formidable evil, had been intimated by De Tocqueville, some thirty years since, in his celebrated work on America. The justice of his prediction is at least recognised thus far: that this evil is put forth by the South, as the one great cause of their secession. Such is the language of Mr. Jefferson Davis's inaugural address—'the tyranny of an unbridled majority, the most odious and least responsible form of despotism.'

It were passing strange, if that which American and European statesmen pronounce to be so intolerable in politics were found to be good in things sacred. One case, indeed, there is in which it may be right for a majority to use their utmost endeavours to crush the teaching of a minority, and that is the case of deadly heresy. But of this just now there is no question. The clergy in Scotland, who hold their incumbencies on the tenure of admitting the primary authority of the Scottish Liturgy, can hardly be supposed to have tolerated such a state of things as the supremacy of an Office supposed by them to be heretical.

It would far exceed our limits, were we to attempt an enumeration of the various methods by which the Church has endeavoured to check the sway of mere numbers. It may be sufficient to allude to that distinction between the *Ecclesia discens* and the *Ecclesia docens* which has led (as Sir F. Palgrave has observed) to the absence of lay names from all canons of Councils, which treat of doctrine as distinguished from discipline.

¹ Cited by Mr. Beresford Hope, in his 'Results of the American Disruption.'

But it is thoroughly germane to our present subject to observe, that if ever a religious community existed, which could ill afford to appeal to a purely numerical test, that community is the Episcopal Church in Scotland. In every other point of view she has strong, abundantly strong, ground. Even waiving for the moment those solemn questions of Apostolic government and succession, she can point to a variety of immense advantages. By her side, in rivalry, stand Presbyterian ministers who (however exemplary in practice) have signed documents so tremendous, that they all but universally shrink from ever setting forth in the pulpit that representation of the Almighty as a jealous tyrant, which is embodied in the Westminster Confession, and to which they have given their formal adhesion. And while the Kirk, with some honourable and distinguished exceptions, has for a long time frowned down literature and innocent amusements, Episcopacy has ever taken a gentler tone, and avoided the risk of driving men into the reckless use of ardent spirits as a compensation for the absence of less coarse forms of relaxation.¹ A mere handful of the population, Scotch Episcopalians have produced a list of distinguished men out of all proportion with their numbers. Their Episcopate has been in times past, and still is, composed of very remarkable men. We shall hardly be suspected, in this Review, of unduly praising a body, whose decisions we have had the misfortune to think ourselves compelled to criticise and oppose. The more safely, then, and fearlessly may we speak of the many virtues of that bench. Placed in a very trying position, without recognised rank, with miserably scanty incomes, they have been preserved from many dangers which beset the wearers of mitres better endowed with this world's goods and honours. No foundation of families on ecclesiastical revenues, no questionable votes in the House of Lords, can be thrown in the teeth of these prelates by their flocks. On the contrary, the great majority, more especially of those now living, have been serious losers by their munificence.

If there be any ground for this widely-spread distrust of the sway of mere numbers in affairs of state—if in questions of religion the importance and delicacy of the subject-matter render the danger unspeakably more imminent—then is it high time to ask those who would resign the Scottish Liturgy, whether they are not, so far as in them lies, tending to foster and encourage this perilous tendency.

¹ Much evidence on this head may be gleaned from the 3d volume of Chambers's '*Domestic Annals*.' Confer also the striking article on Scotland in *Temple Bar*, No. III. We had marked this article for quotation, but the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* has anticipated us.

What is the announcement made in the very first page of the Dean of Edinburgh's pamphlet? On the subject of that canon (the 21st) of the present Scotch code, which assigns to this Liturgy its primary position, we are told that '*a very large majority of Scottish Episcopalians anxiously expect some adjustment of that canon in order to meet the requirements of public opinion.*'

'A very large majority!' 'The requirements of public opinion!' And is it really come to this? The test which would have condemned Elijah, condemned the seven thousand faithful ones, condemned the long roll of those under the elder covenant 'of whom the world was not worthy,' condemned the 'noble army of martyrs'—of its greatest crime we forbear to speak—has it suddenly become something so high and holy, that we are at once to bow to its verdict as authoritative and final? And in Scotland too; where 'public opinion' has long since pronounced—not against the Scottish Liturgy merely, but against Episcopacy itself, root and branch.

What if our fathers in the last century had listened to such appeals and acted on them? 'Public opinion' was then completely set against the use of the 'Athanasian Creed,' the Communion Service, and very much besides. The very apologists for Christianity did not wholly escape the lowering tone of their age. How should we have fared, if there had been handed down to us a prayer-book suited to the temper of the 'large majority' and 'the requirements of public opinion?'

One by one, of different tempers and in different ways, yet each doing their own appointed work, such persons as Bishop Butler, Robert Nelson, Bishop Horne, Jones of Nayland, Samuel Johnson, Bishop Gibson, the poet Cowper, Hannah More, William Wilberforce, contended for the value and importance of this or that objective truth, or internal sentiment, which their age was ready to throw away as obsolete and useless. And if such champions may have mourned at times over the little progress that half-forgotten truths appeared to make, they may have consoled themselves by such reflections as have since been embodied in those noble lines of the American poet, Bryant, wherein he compares the combatants for truth with those of the actual and material battle-field:—

'Soon rested those who fought; but thou
Who minglest in the harder strife
For truths which men receive not now,
Thy warfare only ends with life.
A friendless warfare! lingering long
Through weary day and weary year:
A wild and many-weaponed throng
Hang on thy front, and flank, and rear.

Yet nerve thy spirit to the proof,
And blench not at thy chosen lot.
*The timid good may stand aloof,
The sage may frown—yet faint thou not.*

* * * *

Truth, crush'd to earth, shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies among his worshippers.

* * * *

Another hand the sword shall wield,
Another hand the standard wave,
Till from the trumpet's mouth is peal'd
The blast of triumph o'er thy grave.'

In like manner do we thoroughly believe it possible that 'The Future of the Scottish Liturgy' is, that it should prove (in common with those of many other lands) 'an ensign to the nations' far and wide, a trumpet-voiced witness for the truth of the one great and infinite sacrifice, a weapon of priceless value against the assaults of Rationalism. But that 'Future' may perchance not be granted to our eyes to see; that change which the progress of Neology will operate in the minds of Christians may not be the work of a day, may not emerge until the present race of combatants has given way to a newer generation, and the hand that traces these lines be cold in dust.

Of what sort are the considerations that, in a religious controversy, lend weight to the judgment of the minority? Suppose that in reading a history of the Church in Africa, we found that, during the temporary triumph of the Donatists, one diocese had been conspicuous above the rest for its fidelity, and that this diocese employed, in more of its churches than did any other diocese, a particular liturgy. Surely this would be felt by impartial students to afford a strong claim for the retention of an office associated with such noble endurance in the evil day. Now, *mutato nomine*, this is actually the case. The diocese of Aberdeen is the diocese where (as even Lord Macaulay admits) Episcopacy was never really overthrown; and the diocese of Aberdeen is precisely that which employs, in much the largest proportion, the Scottish Liturgy.

Let us imagine that, in reading the account of a provincial Council, we found that the clergy of two dioceses were summoned, in an especially solemn and prayerful manner, to make choice of their representative among 'those of the second throne,' as Eusebius calls the presbyters; and that these two dioceses, though in a minority, agreed in supporting a certain cause. Would not such a fact deeply colour our estimate of the contest? Now, in the Synods lately held in Scotland, for the

choice of representatives, the dioceses of Moray and of Brechin have been summoned on this wise, and *both* (we believe) *send up defenders of the Scottish Liturgy.*

It is common to charge upon this often-calumniated Office the credit of everything that goes wrong in Scotland. So completely does this seem to be the case in the minds of certain of its opponents, that we have often doubted whether, even for their own sakes, it would not be a kindness to retain it. For if that liturgy were once abolished, they would lose the benefit of that consolation, which they now enjoy, of being able to account satisfactorily to their own minds for the origin of every conceivable failure and disappointment. So universal, with such persons, is the attribution of every possible lack of success to this one source, that at moments we have been irresistibly reminded of 'the great fire at Wolf's Crag,' which the ancient retainer, in the most pathetic of all Scott's tales, determined to assign as the cause of everything that was awaiting to the House of Ravenswood.

Thus, for instance, the latest calamities of the Scottish Church, the trials of the Bishop of Brechin and of Mr. Cheyne, have been ascribed to the existence of this Office. The assertion is demonstrably false upon historical grounds. The Bishop of Brechin avowedly wrote and published his Charge in order to meet, by anticipation, any injury which might possibly accrue to the Church of which he was an overseer, from the dangers of the trial of Archdeacon Denison. The publication of Mr. Cheyne's sermons arose out of the first discussion of Bishop Forbes's Charge. In a word, that controversy *originated in England*, and then spread to Scotland. It had nothing whatever to do with the Scottish Office.

But says the Dean of Edinburgh, in his appeal to the defenders of this liturgy: 'You must have seen that no religious community in Scotland has so slight a hold upon the confidence and affections of the mass of her lay members as our own. No religious community contributes so little in comparison with the means at their disposal' (p. 24). We may grant the facts, while we utterly differ as to the cause. We may grant the facts, and at the same time gladly proclaim how much, how very much, in a contrary direction, has been effected by the influence of Dean Ramsay himself. We have heard, from those who were not of his school of theology, how admirably he has managed the members of his own congregation; how greatly the dangerous fashionableness of Episcopacy in Edinburgh has been saved from many perils attendant upon such a species of popularity by his plainness of speech, both within and without the walls of St. John's church. We know, too, of his ready and

unfailing hospitality extended, without the least regard of party, to all who have had the very slightest claim (or even no claim) upon his attention, of whom many would have looked for it vainly elsewhere. Few can hope to unite in their own persons so many gifts calculated to win the respect and attachment of their countrymen: nor would any consideration induce us thus to devote so many pages to an attack upon his arguments, were it not for the conviction that, in such a cause, it is most needful that this pamphlet should meet with a reply.

To return to the particular point at issue. Our case would be this: We believe that about one-tithe of the lack of zeal on the part of some of the laity may be attributable to the Scottish Office, and that this is amply compensated, not only by the value of that Office, as already set forth, but likewise by the increased zeal of other laymen who are attached to that Office. Who is the one layman of high political station who came down to speak courageous words for Scottish Episcopacy at Leith and Edinburgh last year? We need not name him; but it bears upon our present theme to observe, that he is a fervid admirer and supporter of the Scottish Liturgy.

But how, then, do we account for the remaining nine-tenths of that want of zeal which we lamentingly admit? We attribute it to the *very peculiar position of Scotch Episcopalians, living under a constitutional government, among countrymen of a different persuasion.* Let us try to explain this peculiarity.

Scotch Episcopalians are believed to possess above three-fifths of the land. They include in their ranks, with a very few exceptions, the nobles and the historic families.¹ But the relations between the many and the upper classes are very peculiar in Scotland: and while the masses entertain a deep respect for antiquity of race and local connexion, they combine with it a strong under-current of feeling against Episcopacy. There are few, if any, of the larger cities, in which an Episcopalian would have the slightest chance of being elected

¹ 'And what of the nobles and gentry? By the end of 1637, there were at least twenty of the Scottish nobles pledged, along with the leading clergy, and with the chief burghs, to the pending contest,—the Earls of Angus, Rothes, Sutherland, Dalhousie, Cassilis, Wemyss, and Lothian; and Lords Sinclair, Dalkeith, Lindsay, Balmerino, Burleigh, Hume, Boyde, Yesten, Cranstoun, Loudon, Montgomery, Dalzell, and Fleming. These names it is all the more necessary to enumerate, because most of them are still known in the highest ranks of our British peerage; although in course of time the Presbyterian associations, which were once their distinction, have ceased to encircle them; and their present wearers are almost to a man dutiful members of that Church into which their forefathers refused to be forced, but which has since, by a milder and more natural mode of suasion, attached to itself gradually the whole aristocracy of Scotland.'—*Professor Masson, in 'Macmillan's Magazine' for 1861 (Vol. iv. p. 373).*

as a member of parliament. In the counties, where broad acres and ancestral claims come into play, it is no doubt very different. Yet even there, *a zealous activity on behalf of their own communion is so much loss of political capital.*

We beg particular attention to this indisputable fact. Now it is a first axiom in moral theology, that we have no right to expect heroic virtue from the mass of ordinary Christians. But to be a zealous lay Churchman in Scotland does require some dash of the heroic. All honour to those who exhibit such conduct, and better things than any which they may lose here on earth! But, as human nature goes, we may often have felt regret, during a residence in North Britain, but seldom surprise, when we heard of such dialogues as these:— (1) 'Well, Mr.—, has — been displaying any more of 'his munificence in Church matters?' 'Why, since he was 'returned for the county of —, he has become rather cooler; 'at any rate, less demonstrative. His wife remains as staunch 'as ever; but we must not look for so much from him.' [N.B. The speaker was an Incumbent of by no means High-Church sentiments]. (2) 'I suppose, Lady —, being a Church- 'woman, has contributed to the erection of the new church 'at —?' 'No. She wrote to the Incumbent [himself, by 'the way, a most liberal-handed donor], that she wished him all 'success; but as her late husband had once occupied an official 'position in connexion with the Scotch Establishment, it might 'look disrespectful to his memory, if she were to aid in the 'erection of an Episcopal Church.' (3) 'How very quietly 'the opening of that new church at — was effected; I 'know of many that would have gone up; but there was 'no notice.' 'You see, the elections were just coming on; 'and the brother of the lady who founded it did not wish 'to remind people in an ostentatious manner of the family 'creed.' (4) 'How is it, that I hear of Miss — going to 'the Free Kirk on Sunday? I am sure she cannot like it.' 'The Free-Kirkers opposed her father at the last election, and 'he wants to soften them.'

We might fill pages with revelations of this sort. We might tell of one county, where the Episcopalian lairds favoured their countrymen by contributing far more largely to the Presbyterian Establishment than to their own Church. We might name another, where the heir of one of the first families, whose father had for some years been the representative, ventured to attack the intense Sabbatarianism of his countrymen. Dr. Hessey said a good deal more than this gentleman in his 'Bampton Lectures' for 1860; and the *Edinburgh Review* declared, that the facts alleged by Dr. Hessey about Scotch

Sabbatarianism, could not be impeached by any who knew the country, though they might differ about the inferences deducible from them. This English divine, after the publication of these Lectures, received an honorary distinction from his bishop. Far different was the fate of the Scotch layman. Till then, he had enjoyed the fairest prospects of sitting for the county; but, from that day, his fate was sealed, and this much-prized honour fell from his grasp.

Will it be said that we are representing the Scottish laity as less courageous, less willing to make sacrifices for principle, further removed from the influence of the supernatural than the gentry of England? Not so: for it is well-nigh impossible to form a judgment, seeing that the English gentry have never yet been subjected to a similar trial. The relations between the two classes of the voters and their representatives are, we repeat, not only unknown in England, but they are barely conceivable. If a zealous Episcopalian is elected for a county or for any of the smaller Scotch burghs (and there are such among Scotch M.P.'s), it is despite his Churchmanship: just as some of Louis Philippe's supporters declared that they chose him for their king, *non parceque Bourbon, mais quoique Bourbon*. His religious earnestness for his own communion is so much of dead weight against him. How astonished would English county members be to find this. When a few years since the late Mr. Sidney Herbert contested South Wilts with Lord Henry Thynne, who ever thought of alleging against the one candidate the magnificent church at Wilton, against the other, the munificent church restorations &c. effected by his mother, Lady Bath. In Scotland each candidate would have found this a serious drawback.

It is far otherwise across the Atlantic. There Presbyterianism is not established and endowed. There if the State shows any favour, it is rather for than against Episcopacy. There the army, as at West Point (and, perhaps, at other military colleges), hardly recognises any form of worship save the Episcopal. There no Lord Advocate ever finds his love for Apostolic order a difficulty to him as lawyer or member of congress. There whole flocks have come over to us, with their pastors, from Presbyterianism.

The presence of a Liturgy, very like the Scottish, has in no wise interfered with the progress of the Church in America. The withdrawal of the Scottish Liturgy immediately and *in toto* would, we firmly believe, scarcely make a particle of difference in the relations between the upper and lower classes in Scotland. As it is, in a very large portion of the country neither clergy nor laity need be troubled by its presence at all. 'To me,'

writes Dean Ramsay, 'as an individual clergyman in English orders, the Scottish Office may be truly said to be a myth. After thirty-seven years' service in the Church, I have communicated but twice by the Scottish Office, and never officiated in the service at all.' After this, can we wonder that when it is sought to introduce a canon avowedly intended to abolish this Liturgy in a few years, Dr. Neale should say:— 'The contest is not *ἐξ ἰσού*. We fight for a permissive use, our opponents contend for an absolute veto; we seek not to rob them of the Anglican Liturgy, they do seek to deprive us of our one little ewe lamb—the Scotch. Theirs is an aggression, ours a pure defence; theirs an innovation, ours the *status quo*: and therefore something more than a mere majority is, on every principle of moral justice, required, on the same principle that, when a committee that has no casting vote, or bench of judges, are equally divided, the motion falls to the ground.'

Another loss, if this Office is abolished, would be that of the practice of Reservation sanctioned by the Scottish use. On this point we hope to be able to add a word in an appendix.

Though we have not time to enter into details, we would beg the consideration of those most interested to a very important letter, headed *Votum pro Pace*, in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* for November 17, 1859. Even if they cannot assent to every position taken up by the writer, the Rev. G. H. Forbes, they will find it highly suggestive. Will not the abolition of the Scottish Office by majorities be a triumph of the less learned many over the more learned few?

We have not even touched upon the subject of the second pamphlet on our list. It may be that the mere thought of anything that even looked like a bargain, the desire to abstain from the very appearance of evil, and to provide things honest in the sight of all men, may have urged the writer of this very forcible brochure, in company with many more, into an overstrained view of the relations between the debate in Convocation and the meeting of the Scotch Bishops. But we must frankly own that the explanations, even of so eminently fair a person as the Bishop of Edinburgh, have not been wholly satisfactory to our minds; and knowing the *perferendum ingenium Scotorum*, we can hardly wonder if, after reading the debate in the English Convocation, there swept across the minds of many, for the moment, thoughts not wholly unlike those expressed in the fiery lines of Cowley:—

' . . . Come the eleventh plague rather than this should be;
Come, sink us rather in the sea.

Come rather, pestilence and reap us down;
Come God's sword rather than our own.

* * * *

In all the bonds we ever bore;
We grieved, we sighed, we wept, *we never blushed before.*

Assuredly the mere fact of that debate is, to our minds, an argument against any serious alteration.

Three hundred years ago our English forefathers acted the part of Resigners. While avowing that the Office as it stood in the first book of King Edward was sound and scriptural, they yielded to the wishes of foreign Calvinists. Of such yieldings, whatever excuse be made for them, there can be but one result. *Those, to whom the concession is made, practically drag down the doctrine of a majority to their own level.*

III. A few words, and a few only, must be added with respect to the proposed alterations either in the actual language of the Office or in its position and authority in Scotland.

This is, in the main, the line which seems to have been taken by the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*. In advocating some such change, our contemporary has not, we are bound to say, been deficient either in fairness or in dignity. We may regret the loss of that thorough advocacy of the Office which used to distinguish the *Journal*, but its reasonings have been very temperate, and it has been open to the expression of opinions on both sides, so that forcible arguments, both *pro* and *contra*, may be read in the many able letters published in its columns.

Of course we must look facts in the face. If it be really found impossible to retain the Office precisely *in statu quo ante Synodum habitam*, it is for the defenders to make the best terms that they can. We will mention the various proposals.

(a.) We hear that an eminent English ritualist, who has lived in Scotland, suggests the adoption of the Laudian Office of 1637. That Office is, undoubtedly, one of great worth and beauty. But it must be remembered that it has never yet received any save royal authority: a circumstance likely to prejudice Scotchmen against it; for it is a prominent characteristic of Scottish religion (and surely a very noble one) to be very anti-Erastian. Moreover, this Office does not enjoy a good report of them that are without. It is the very service at which Janet Geddes threw her three-legged stool; and even cultivated Presbyterians, witness the Duke of Argyll, appear to have a kindly predilection for the memory of that particularly Christian and reverent action. Consequently, though we ourselves should have little or no objection to this change, it appears (not unnaturally) to lack support in Scotland.

(b.) A distinguished Scottish ritualist, Mr. G. H. Forbes, publishes an amended form of the Scottish Office. The changes which he proposes are in themselves an addition to the beauty and precision of the Office; but although most consonant (as we might expect) to ancient usages, they are so slight, that we feel almost convinced that they would fail to abate one iota of the prejudice, which ultra-Protestant associations, or want of intimate acquaintance with Holy Scripture and antiquity, have created in the minds of many Scottish lairds, and some persons who are not Scottish lairds.

(c.) The proposals of the Dean of Edinburgh (though supported by two eminent and excellent lay members of the committee) would leave the Office for the future in every congregation that uses it, *at the mercy of a mere majority of lay communicants*; without the faintest consideration for the zeal, learning, ability, or munificence which might distinguish the minority, without the slightest regard for the feelings or wishes of the new incumbent. *We earnestly trust and pray that this proposed form of Canon XXXII. of the New Code may be utterly and summarily rejected.*

(d.) With sincere diffidence we should venture to think that the best course for those who love and cherish 'this most 'beautiful and affecting service'¹ would be (if they find it hopeless to preserve it) an adoption of the proposals of Mr. Forbes Irvine, of Drum. If that modification be untenable, they might fall back upon the changes suggested by Mr. Walker of Bowland. [We hope to print these proposals in an Appendix.]

And now it remains alone that we pray, and entreat others to pray, that the Divine blessing may rest upon the acts of this forthcoming Synod. Most completely do we agree with Dr. Neale that these weapons may avail more than all other arguments and influences put together. The proposed Code of New Canons, though presenting many points which require delicate handling, and thoughtful, prayerful consideration, reflects the very highest credit on the tact, judgment, and good feeling of the committee. The possession of laymen so able and devoted is a great fact in itself. May their labours avail to the furtherance of all that is good in their Church, and therefore (it is a necessary consequence) prove a blessing to the realm of Scotland.

¹ *Quarterly Review*, No. CLVIII.

APPENDIX.

1. ON RESERVATION FOR THE SICK.

It was once the writer's privilege to assist in ministering to the needs of the sick and dying in the houses and hospitals of a manufacturing town at a time when it was visited by a virulent typhoid fever. One of the curates fell a victim to his zeal; and the Roman Catholic priests in the place were excused by their superiors from hearing confessions, though not before two or three of their number had died in consequence. As we quitted the room of the hospital with a priest who had been administering to some of the sick, what may have proved their last reception, he said to us, 'I do regret that we have not retained the use of reservation: to have to consecrate, under such circumstances, amidst such sights and sounds, was painful; and it must, I fear, have seemed irreverent to those Irish who were lying near us.' It might have been added, that reservation would have shortened the service for the recipient, and saved what was then very valuable time for the clergy. A few years later, the same town, in common with very many more, suffered severely from cholera. Reports reached the writer (no longer a resident there) of the same want being keenly and urgently felt. Time was, humanly speaking, everything; and the power of reservation would have (practically) much extended the time at disposal. It may be observed that the Articles do not represent the practice to be unprimitive, or even unapostolic, but simply deny that it is 'by Christ's ordinance.' Almost as much might, perhaps, be said about Confirmation.

Little did we think that there was any part of Britain wherein this ancient custom still obtained. Whatever defence may be made for its rejection at the Reformation, few, we believe, who have ever seen it in use, will maintain that it is now liable to abuse, or that it is not a practice as eminently convenient and reverential as it is primitive. But if the Scottish Churchmen give up their Liturgy, they will lose all the benefit of reservation. Some years afterwards, it will hardly be believed that a Christian community possessed this treasure and ruthlessly flung it away! But we, as we have said, hope better things. We look for a brighter *Future of the Scottish Liturgy*. With an ancient poet, heathen though he was, we feel—

Ἐλπεσθαι χρὴ πάντ', ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲν ἄελπον.
 ῥᾶδια πάντα Θεῷ τέλεισαι, καὶ ἀνήνυτον οὐδέν.¹

APPENDIX II.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED FOR REVISION OF THE CODE OF CANONS.

BISHOP of EDINBURGH.

BISHOP of GLASGOW.

DEAN of EDINBURGH, *Convener*.

Rev. CHARLES PRESSLEY, Fraserburgh.

Rev. GEO. HAY FORBES, Burntisland.

WILLIAM SMYTHE, Esq. of Methven.

WILLIAM STUART WALKER, Esq. of Bowland.

WILLIAM LESLIE, Esq. of Warthill.

ALEXANDER FORBES IRVINE, Esq. of Drum.

JAMES STEUART, Esq. W.S.

HUGH JAMES ROLLO, Esq., W.S., *Clerk*.

¹ Fragment of Lines given in the *Poeta Gnomici* (Ed. Tauch.).

APPENDIX III.

PROPOSALS BY DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE.

The DEAN OF EDINBURGH, Mr. SMYTHE of Methven, and Mr. LESLIE of Warthill, propose that the remainder of this Canon shall be as follows:—

6. The Services and Ritual of this Church shall be, so far as circumstances admit, identical with the Services and Ritual of the Book of Common Prayer. The Communion Service of the Episcopal Church in Scotland is hereby declared to be that of the Communion Service of the Church of England, and the same shall be used at the consecration of Bishops, the ordinations of Priests and Deacons, and at the opening of all General Synods and all Diocesan Synods.

7. This enactment shall not affect the present practice of the congregations of this Church who now use the Office for the administration of the Holy Communion, generally known as the Scottish Communion Office. In such congregations the use of the said Scottish Communion Office shall be continued during the lifetime of the present Incumbents, except in cases where the Incumbent and a majority of the congregation shall petition the Bishop of the Diocese to have the exclusive use of the Office contained in the Book of Common Prayer.

8. On the death or resignation of any Incumbent of a church where the Scottish Office is now used, the Office of the Book of Common Prayer shall be at once adopted, except a petition shall be offered by a majority of the male communicants in favour of the continuance of the Scottish Office; and this rule shall apply to the case of every death or resignation of an Incumbent in all time coming where the Scottish Office is used.

Mr. WALKER of Bowland proposes, that, in addition to the five Sections agreed to by the Committee, the following Sections should be adopted:—

6. The Scotch Communion Office hereby authorized shall be held to be that form of the said Office, which is signed by the Bishops of this Church as relative hereto. The same shall be deposited for preservation among the records of the Episcopal Synod; and it is hereby declared that the Scotch Communion Office, as hereby authorized, and the English Office, are held by this Church to be identical in doctrine and of equal authority.

7. In all congregations formed after the date of these Canons, the persons forming the congregation, or a majority of them, shall determine, subject to the approval of the Bishop of the Diocese, which of the two offices shall be used therein.

8. No substitution of the one Office for the other shall be lawful in any congregation, unless three-fourths at the least of the Male Communicants shall have expressed in writing their desire for the change, and the Bishop of the Diocese shall have signified in writing his approval thereof.

9. An appeal to the Episcopal Synod against the Bishop's decision shall be competent under Sections 6 and 7 of this Canon, and the decision of the Episcopal Synod shall be final.

10. In all consecrations of Bishops, and at the opening of all General Synods, the two Offices shall be used alternately on each successive occasion.

Mr. JAMES STEUART, W.S., adopts Mr. WALKER's leading Clauses, subject to the following alteration:—

That the English Office shall in future be used in all new congregations, and at all Consecrations, Ordinations, and Synods.

Mr. FORBES IRVINE of Drum *proposes, that in addition to the five Sections agreed to by the Committee, the following Sections should be adopted:—*

6. As in order to promote a union among all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, permission was formerly granted by the Bishops to retain the use of the English Communion Office in all congregations where the said Office had been previously in use, the same permission is now ratified and confirmed.

7. The Scottish Communion Office shall continue to be held of primary authority in this Church, and shall be used not only in all Consecrations of Bishops, but also at the opening of all General Synods.

8. If the Incumbent of any congregation, and one-half of the male communicants, qualified in terms of Canon XXIV., request the Bishop of the Diocese to sanction the alternative use of the English and Scottish Offices in such congregation, such sanction shall be given by the Bishop; and if the Incumbent of any congregation, and three-fourths of the male communicants, qualified as above, request the Bishop to sanction the substitution of either Office for the other in such congregation, such sanction shall be given by the Bishop.

Rev. G. H. FORBES *proposes, that, in addition to the five Sections agreed to by the Committee, the following Sections should be adopted, if they should be agreed to by both those who use the Scotch Communion Office and those who use the English Office; the subject-matter of the present Canon partaking (as has been twice decided by the Episcopal Synod) of the nature of a compact between these two parties, and consequently, as Mr. G. H. FORBES maintains, not being within the competency of a mere majority in the General Synod; it being, in fact, the 'acknowledged practice,' which Canon XXXIII. of the present Code declares a General Synod has not the power to alter:—*

6. As, in order to promote a union among all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, permission was formerly granted by the Bishops to retain the use of the English Communion Office in all congregations where the said Office had been previously in use, the same permission is now ratified and confirmed.

7. In all other congregations formed prior to the enactment of the present code of Canons, the arrangements now in force with regard to the use of the Scotch Communion Office, or of that contained in the Book of Common Prayer presently used in the United Church of England and Ireland, or of their alternate use, are hereby confirmed and sanctioned.

8. In any congregation formed after the enactment of these Canons, the Bishop shall ascertain which Office the majority of the communicants composing it desire to be used, and shall make order accordingly.

9. If at any time a petition, signed by a majority of the regular communicants of two years' standing of any congregation, be presented to the Bishop of the Diocese, praying that the Communion Office used in the said congregation may be altered, he shall direct such change to be made.

10. If a minority of the regular communicants in any congregation in which the Scotch Communion Office is used, shall express to the Bishop, in writing, their desire to have opportunities of communicating according to the Communion Office of the Church of England, or *vice versa*, the Bishop shall permit the use of the said other Office at such times as shall not interfere with the existing services of said congregation. Provided that if the Pastor of that congregation be unwilling to celebrate, or to provide for the celebration of such additional services, the petitioners shall present to the Bishop some other Presbyter, to be by him licensed to perform the same.

11. The edition of the Scotch Communion Office to be used on all public occasions, and to be referred to in the Church Courts on questions of doctrine, is hereby declared to be the copy annexed to this Code of Canons: Provided that any congregation presently using the Scotch Communion Office may continue to use the edition in common circulation at present.

(N.B.—*The suggested edition has been printed, and will be furnished on application to Rev. G. H. Forbes.*

12. The Scotch Office shall be used at all Consecrations and Ordinations, and at Synods, whenever the Holy Eucharist is celebrated at them; but no ecclesiastical censure shall be incurred by any person attending a Synod for declining to communicate thereat.

13. By the term 'regular communicant,' shall be understood a person who in the course of the year has communicated at least three times, of which the festival of Easter, or of Whitsunday or of Christmas, has been one.

APPENDIX IV.

The alterations in the new edition of the Scottish Liturgy proposed by the Rev. G. H. Forbes are not numerous. They appear to be based upon the Liturgy of S. James; and are, as has been intimated, of much beauty. The most important is the addition to the Invocation. Immediately after the words 'that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly 'beloved Son,' it is added, 'for the forgiveness of our sins, for our growth in 'grace, for the bringing forth of good works, and for obtaining life everlasting.' No liturgical scholar can object to this, but it will not satisfy the objectors.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE ARTICLE ON 'ESSAYS AND
REVIEWS' (page 102).

London, June 26, 1862.

SINCE the above was in type the judgment of the Court of Arches has been given in the cases of the Bishop of Salisbury *v.* Williams, and Findall *v.* Wilson. The delay in pronouncing judgment was notoriously caused by the appeal in the case of the Bishop of Winchester *v.* Heath. Our readers are aware that the highest court has rejected the appeal of Mr. Heath, and affirmed the judgment of the lower court. They are also aware that the Judge in the Court of Arches intentionally delayed his judgment till he should hear whether his previous judgment would be negatived or not. The evident reluctance with which Dr. Lushington pronounced judgment against Mr. Heath, would have led many to suppose that he waited for the express purpose of seeing whether the higher court would reverse any such condemnation as he might consequently be led to express.

There can be no doubt that had the judgment of the Privy Council acquitted Mr. Heath, it would have carried with it the acquittal of Mr. Wilson and of Dr. Williams. It would have been plain that no opinion of any kind on the side of leaving all doctrines open questions, possibly with the exception of certain doctrines of the Church of Rome, could be judged at variance with the letter of the formularies of the Church of England. It is conceivable that the direct and formal contradiction in terms of a statement in the Prayer Book or Articles might still be thought to afford matter for prosecution, but practically the effect would have been that a Clergyman might hold, unrebuked, any opinion that he pleased on theological matters. We suppose, that had the judgment in the case of Burder *v.* Heath been different from what it was, Dr. Lushington would have conceived himself bound to pronounce sentence at once in favour of the defendants in the two famous cases upon which judgment *was to be pronounced* yesterday. We advisedly use the words *was to be pronounced*, for we cannot see that any judgment has actually been pronounced. We venture to think that there was no person interested in this trial who anticipated any such evasion of a difficulty as that to which Dr. Lushington has resorted. We had our own opinion as to which way the sentence of the court would go. Others may have entertained a different opinion, but probably all concurred in the expectation that Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson would either be declared to have contravened the formularies of the Church of England, and so rendered them-

selves liable to deprivation, subject, of course, to their right of appeal to the higher court, or that a declaration would have been enunciated to the effect that such statements as they had made were within the limit of that liberty of interpretation granted to clergymen of the Church of England.

Instead of this we have the following so called 'Judgment' pronounced. It occurs at the end of an elaborate summary, both of the attack and defence of Dr. Rowland Williams. That we may not misrepresent the learned judge, we give his own words:—

'The result of the observation I have made in this case is, that these articles must be reformed by striking out all those I have rejected, and by partial alterations in others. I think my Judgment will clearly point out what I deem requisite, and that I need not expend further time in recapitulation. Looking at the great importance of this case, and that in fact, though not in form, I have pronounced a decision upon the merits, I will, if it be desired, give to either or both parties leave to appeal to her Majesty in Council.'

The only mode in which we can interpret the above is as follows:—The judge expresses his opinion that certain of the articles charged against the defendant must be rejected, certain others ought to be reformed, and that the remainder must be admitted, and that before judgment is pronounced, he allows of an appeal to the Privy Council, for either party. How an appeal can be where there is nothing to appeal from, entirely transcends our limited powers of understanding. It looks very much like the case of a judge not liking to give judgment in a case, in a direction contrary to his wishes, and getting out of the difficulty by suggesting that another court should take upon itself the decision of the case.

In proceeding to criticize, not the judgment of the Court of Arches, but the private opinion of the presiding judge, we must take it for granted that our readers are aware of the form of the indictment, and the general line of defence taken by the counsel for the defendants. Those who have not followed the proceedings, nor had the opportunity of reading the speech for the defence of Dr. Williams, made by Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, which has since been published entire, will be able to follow what we have to say, if they will take the trouble to refer to the learned judge's summing up of the case, which appeared in the *Times* of this morning.

Of the seventeen articles of the indictment, Dr. Lushington rejects all from the eighth to the seventeenth inclusive, with the exception of the twelfth, the fifteenth, and the sixteenth, the first of which he thinks must be reformed, and the other two must be admitted. With much of what the learned judge has alleged on this subject we entirely concur. There can be no doubt to our mind that, shocking as Dr. Williams's opinions on the subject of prophecy are, and entirely differing as they do from any views that have hitherto been entertained by any Churchmen, the expression of them given us in his eulogy of Baron Bunsen does not, in express terms, contravene any formulary or article of the Church of England. The same may be said of Dr. Williams's opinion as regards the authorship and contents of the books of Daniel and Jonah. Dr. Lushington truly observes that this does not amount to a denial of the canonicity of these two books, a denial which, as he remarks, would be a con-

travention of the Sixth Article of the Church of England. It is only when we come to the tenth article of the indictment that we find ourselves seriously at variance with Dr. Lushington. One part of this count charges Dr. Williams with the denial of the canonical authority of the Second Epistle of S. Peter. The passage from the Essay was quoted by the judge, and runs as follows:—

‘The second of the Petrine Epistles having alike external and internal evidence against its genuineness is necessarily surrendered as a whole; and our critic’s good faith in this respect is more certain than the ingenuity with which he reconstructs a part of it.’ ‘The second chapter may not improbably be a quotation, but its quoter and the author of the rest of the epistle need not, therefore, have been S. Peter.’ Dr. Lushington concludes from this sentence that Dr. Williams denies the *genuineness* of the second Epistle of S. Peter—*i. e.* that he denies that the writer of that epistle was the Apostle to whom it is generally ascribed; and he refuses to condemn him on this account, because the idea of genuineness is distinct from that of canonical authority. ‘If,’ says he, ‘I was to condemn on this statement, I must hold that the denying a book to be genuine necessarily implies a denial of its canonicity, and does not mean exclusively a denial of the particular authorship. Considering the word *genuine* is susceptible of these two meanings, I think there is a doubt as to the sense in which Dr. Williams has expressed himself, and if there be a doubt, as this is a criminal case, he is entitled to the benefit of it.’ Now, we have explained in the earlier part of this article that genuineness has nothing whatever to do in ordinary cases with authenticity or authority. The distinction is one which is recognised in all elementary works on theology, and every student is familiar with it. In the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is also alluded to in the judgment, Dr. Williams is certainly entitled, not to the benefit of a doubt, as the learned judge absurdly enough expresses it. If he doubts whether S. Paul wrote that epistle he is entitled to acquittal from any charge which is fastened on him as contravening anything that he is bound to believe. No one is bound to believe in the authorship; but the clergy are certainly bound to believe that it is authoritative, whoever its author might have been. But now let us see how the case stands with regard to the Second Epistle of S. Peter. It is admitted on all hands, by Dr. Williams himself, by the counsel for the defence, and by the learned judge, that its genuineness is denied. That is to say, Dr. Williams asserts that S. Peter was not the author. Now, if we turn to the epistle itself we shall see that it asserts its own authorship in the most unequivocal terms. It begins with the words, ‘Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Christ,’ &c. It proceeds further on to allude to the transfiguration, so that the writer again here pretends to be S. Peter, when he says, ‘And this voice which came from heaven we heard when we were with Him in the holy mount.’ Again, towards the end of the epistle we have an allusion to a previous letter in the words, ‘This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you, in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance’—and again the writer speaks of himself as being one of ‘the apostles of the Lord and Saviour.’ Nothing can be clearer, then, than that the writer, whoever he was,

pretended to be S. Peter. Well, then, it follows from this that he who denies that this epistle was written by the apostle must consider it a mere forgery. There is no intermediate position which can be maintained, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which contains no internal evidence to decide the matter. Either S. Peter wrote this epistle, or it is a simple forgery from beginning to end, and as such entitled to no authority whatever. And we submit that it is impossible to conceive a more distinct contradiction of the Sixth Article of the Church of England, than this amounts to. The Article asserts that 'All the Books of the New Testament as they are commonly received' (and no one will attempt to question that S. Peter's Second Epistle was, at the time of drawing up of the Thirty-nine Articles, and has ever since been, recognised as one of the Books so received), 'we do receive and account them canonical.' And here we are tempted to say a few words on a distinction which is so frequently insisted on in the judgments in the Court of Arches. We have been told over and over again, that it is a court for a decision of law and not of theology. This is quite true, and we have no objection to allege against the statement in the general. And we entirely acquiesce in the maxim laid down by Dr. Lushington, in his preliminary remarks, that following the opinion of the Judicial Committee in the case of *Burder v. Heath*, he was bound to look solely to the Formularies and Articles of the Church—that it would be a departure from his duty if he were to admit any discussion as to the conformity or non-conformity of the Articles of Religion, or any of them with the Holy Scriptures. We quite agree that an appeal to Scripture, in any such case, is beside the point. When the doctrine of the Church of England has fixed the sense of Scripture, the clergy are bound by that sense; where it has not done so, such points must be considered open questions. We, therefore, give our cordial assent to the judgment pronounced, that 'The articles' in which Dr. Williams is accused of contravening passages of Scripture, such as those selected for the epistles and gospels in the Communion Service, 'must be reformed by striking out all reference to extracts from the Bible found 'in the Prayer Book. Pressed by these reasons,' says Dr. Lushington, 'and urged by every motive to preserve peace in the Church, I will not be tempted, in the trial of any accusation against a clergyman, to resort to Scripture as the standard by which the doctrine shall be measured; and I may with perfect truth add that were such a task imposed upon me, the want of theological knowledge would incapacitate me from adequately discharging it.' It is not, perhaps, to be expected that a lawyer should be a profound theologian; and perhaps in many, or even most cases that come before the Court of Arches for decision, little theological knowledge is requisite to determine what is the meaning of the propositions in the formularies by which the judge has to test any given doctrine which a clergyman is accused of publishing. Yet the province of law and the province of theology are not so distinct but what here and there they run into each other. The instance of the genuineness of S. Peter's Second Epistle is in point, and we cannot but think either that the possession of some of that theological knowledge which the learned judge candidly admits he does not possess, would be desirable, or else that the judge in the Court of Arches should have a theologian for his assessor.

With regard to the other articles of the indictment which are rejected, we have not much to say. The last article imputes a tendency in the Essay to inculcate a disbelief of the Divine inspiration and orthodoxy of the Holy Scriptures, to deny the truth of part thereof, and to deny the doctrines of original sin, justification by faith, atonement, propitiation, and the incarnation. We should be unwilling to rest any case on so indefinite a charge as this; and we are content to acquiesce with Dr. Lushington in the principles laid down by the Judicial Committee in the case of *Burder v. Heath*, viz. 'that the words or writings of the person accused must be pleaded; that the meaning which they are alleged by the prosecution to convey must be pleaded, and the particular Articles of Religion or parts of them asserted to be contravened must be pleaded also.' The most important article that Dr. Lushington has admitted is the fifteenth, and his admission of it is to the effect that the following passage from Dr. Williams's Essay is inconsistent with the eleventh of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion.

'Why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind or sense of Divine approval which comes of trust in a righteous God rather than a fiction of merit by transfer? S. Paul would then be teaching moral responsibility as opposed to sacerdotalism.'

Lastly, to say one word about the seventh and twelfth articles of the indictment which are directed to be reformed. In giving judgment on the seventh, the learned judge affords another illustration of the necessity for theological knowledge in one who has to express a legal opinion upon a theological subject. Dr. Lushington professes to be altogether unable to understand the meaning of the words 'a despairing school, which forbids us to trust in God or in conscience unless we kill our souls with literalism;' he therefore passes them by without further notice. Of another passage in the same count he attempts some explanation, and gives his opinion that it does not go the length of impugning the Articles or formularies. The passage is as follows:—

'Again, on the side of external criticism, we find the evidences of our canonical books, and of the patristic authors nearest to them, are sufficient to prove illustrative in outward act of principles perpetually true, but not adequate to guarantee narration inherently incredible or precepts evidently wrong.'

We have no doubt that the explanation given by the judge of this passage, which is the more difficult of the two, is substantially correct; viz. 'that the clergy are at liberty to reject parts of Scripture upon their own opinion that the narrative is inherently incredible, to disregard precepts in Holy Writ because they think them evidently wrong.' But we really are at a loss to conceive what difficulty there is in interpreting the other passage, which has precisely the same drift. It is not otherwise of importance than as illustrating the position we have laid down, that legal knowledge is not sufficient in itself to pronounce upon theological formularies. However, upon the obscurity of these two passages in the count of the indictment, the count itself is directed to be reformed. To us it appears that the foolish and confused statements of these passages might well have been passed by altogether; and on the judge's own showing the count ought to have been admitted on the score of the two other passages quoted. Dr. Lushington is as explicit as we could have desired in

stating his opinion as to the monstrous proposition that the Bible is 'an expression of devout reason,' and is 'the written word of the congregation. We have seldom read anything more lucidly expressed than the judgment upon these two passages and the principle upon which it is pronounced.

Rightly, as it appears to us, declining to enter upon any discussion as to what was 'the earliest creed of the Church,' Dr. Lushington confines his attention to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law established, and he decides that if the Bible be 'God's Word written,' it is not 'the expression of devout reason,' and adds that there is not to be found in the Articles or in the Formularies a single syllable consistent with the assertion that the Bible is the voice of the congregation. We repeat, however, that we can see no reason why the obscurity of one part of the expressions charged against an author should form a safeguard to him, to shield him from the legal penalty he may have incurred by other and more definite statements. We cannot understand why this article should not have been admitted, without regard had to either of the passages which have induced the learned judge to direct that it shall be reformed.

With regard to the twelfth count, Dr. Williams has again the benefit of a doubt given him, to the extent that this article is directed to be reformed because the judge is not satisfied of the meaning to be attached to the following sentence:—

'Salvation from evil, through sharing the Saviour's spirit, was shifted into a notion of purchase from God through the price of His bodily pangs. The deep drama of heart and mind become externalized into a commercial transfer, and this effected by a form of ritual!'

'I am not satisfied,' says Dr. Lushington, 'that Dr. Williams intended thereby to maintain that Christ did not suffer, nor was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, nor to be a sacrifice for the original guilt as well as for the actual sins of men.'

Upon the whole we are of opinion that, with the exception of the remarks we have felt it our duty to make upon this judgment, it is scarcely possible for any one understanding the merits of the case to make any objection to the opinion delivered by Dr. Lushington. We must be allowed again to express our regret that the judgment was not formally delivered. We regret that the presiding judge in any court should have so expressed himself, as to leave ground for thinking that he was unwilling to pronounce judgment, or that he had misgivings as to a case which, it appears to us, could not in the judgment of common sense and common equity, have been other than the conclusion which has been arrived at. In the concluding remarks of the judgment in the case of *Fendall v. Wilson*, the same mistrusting of his own judgment and timidity as regards the strictures of the clergy, is even more apparent. He concludes:—

'I cannot leave these two cases without adding a few words in conclusion. I have discharged my duty to the best of my ability. I am aware that these judgments will be severely canvassed by the clergy and by others. Be it so; thereby it may be ascertained whether they are in accordance with law; and accordance with law ought to be the sole object of a court of justice. It may

'be that on the present occasion some may think that so far from having gone too far, I have taken too limited a view of power entrusted to me, and, consequently, have failed to apply a remedy where a remedy might seem to be wanted. I can only say I have shaped my course according to the authority I am bound to follow—the authority of the Privy Council.'

Besides the judgment on the particular counts of the indictment, there is much that is interesting in the introductory matter of Dr. Lushington's speech. In giving his opinion as to the first class of objections taken by the counsel for the defence, viz. that divers opinions are imputed to Dr. Williams which he has not maintained, he takes occasion to lay down the law as regards a review of an infidel book by a clergyman, and decides that it is not competent to the reviewer, when he either states or professes to give the substance of unsound doctrine from the work reviewed, to leave his own opinion in the dark. In the present instance, he thinks that Dr. Williams shows a general but not indiscriminate approval of the opinions quoted from the works of Baron Bunsen. To all this we think it almost impossible for any reasonable person to object. The next class of exceptions taken to the indictment was of this form:—that the opinions imputed to him have been submitted to a test not warranted by ecclesiastical law, viz. extracts from the Bible. Here again, we think it impossible for any thoughtful person to maintain an objection to the principles laid down that the Prayer-book, the Articles, the Canon, and the Homilies, are the only standards of doctrine. There was no necessity to distinguish between the Homilies and the other formularies, because, in the present case, no offence was alleged against the Homilies; but we have always thought it of the last importance that no pleadings from Scripture should be allowed in a law court. The matter really requires no argument. Nothing can be plainer than that if they were, the whole controversy with Rome, as well as the differences between the Church of England and Protestant bodies, would have perpetually to be argued again, and there would be practically no advantage in the Church possessing any standard of doctrine—so far, that is, as the prevention of the clergy impugning that doctrine was concerned. Again, the unanimous opinion of the bench of bishops was not entitled to any weight in influencing the opinion of the judge, excepting so far forth as any of them may have been learned theologians, and have assisted him in coming to a right understanding either of what the author had said, or of the true meaning of the formularies, by which what he had said would have to be tested. It would seem to be included in this, that the judge was bound, as he professes himself bound, to disregard the opinions of any amount of theologians of the Church of England brought to bear upon the subject. We can only wish that he had here been consistent, and, instead of adhering to the unhappy precedent of the Gorham case, had absolutely rejected all quotations of such authorities, whether alleged by the prosecution or for the defence. In the present instance, the admitting any such opinions makes no difference in the case; for Dr. Williams, for the most part, and as regards the most obnoxious of the statements he has made, stands absolutely alone. In the Gorham case, we cannot but think that they were admitted for the express purpose of reviewing the judgment in the Court of Arches, in order to save Mr. Gorham and the rest of the Evangelical

clergy who disbelieve the plain statement of the Prayer-book on the subject of baptismal regeneration. We think the precedent is most unfortunate, and that especially because the judgment was given in direct contradiction to the opinion of the late Bishop of London, the only theological assessor who was at all competent to give an opinion on the subject.

We have one more grave objection to allege to Dr. Lushington's judgment, and with it we must conclude this already too long postscript. We entirely concur in the opinion laid down that the Articles and the Formularies are the legal tests of doctrine to be applied in the present case. We regret that we must entirely dissent from, and earnestly protest against, the principle laid down that the Court should look first to the Articles, then to the Book of Common Prayer. On the contrary, we think it cannot be too earnestly contended that the Prayer-book contains the doctrines of the Church of England, and that the Articles are, of their very nature, and upon their own showing, a temporary protest, which it may or may not be expedient to continue, against certain false doctrines and practices whether on the Protestant or the Roman side. We say this is palpable on the very surface of the Articles—as, for instance, when it is said that a certain code of doctrine is necessary for these times—the Church of England claims to be the same Church as was established in this country before the time of the Restoration, when the last great changes took place, as well as before the time of the Reformation, by virtue of her inheritance of the apostolic descent through her bishops, and her inheritance of doctrine through her Prayer-book—that continuity would be equally preserved even if in the present or some subsequent generation it should be deemed fit to abolish the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and even if the Church should declare its opinion that they should be abolished altogether. It may be thought an important point whether the preference should be given to the Articles or to the Formularies; but it is not so. The ill effect of any such preference could easily be argued from the fact that the Articles are notoriously ambiguous, and the Prayer-book in its dogmatic statements extremely definite. Moreover, there is a *primâ facie* difference between the two which greatly increases the weight of this argument. The subject is, however, too large for a postscript, and our space warns us that we must conclude.

NOTICES.

WE have received two works from M. F. Huet, of Paris—a life of his ‘guide, philosopher, and friend,’ M. Bordas-Demoulin, and a pamphlet on the solution of the Roman question. The ‘Histoire de la Vie et des Ouvrages’ of the somewhat eccentric, but able and high-principled philosopher and theologian, is very interesting, and will well repay perusal. M. Bordas-Demoulin is not, we believe, much known in England; and we may possibly, in one of our next numbers, revert to him at greater length, and give an account of his very curious life and of his principal works. The present biography is to be had at Michel Levy’s. M. Huet’s other work is entitled, ‘La Sujétion temporelle des Papes; solution politique et catholique de la Question Romaine,’ and is, of course, published by our old friend, M. Dentu, of the Palais-Royal. We shall give, in the author’s own words, the scope and object of his *brochure*:—‘Une admirable et profonde harmonie régnant entre toutes les vérités, il se trouve que la vraie solution politique est en même temps la vraie solution religieuse. C’est la partie du débat sur laquelle on a porté le moins la lumière. En général, le libéralisme s’est tu; le fanatisme seul a parlé. Il sème dans l’univers catholique le trouble et les alarmes. On dépeint l’humiliation du pape, et l’humiliation de l’Eglise dans sa personne; on le représente dépendant du roi d’Italie ou des autres princes, et toute l’Eglise, toutes les consciences asservies avec lui. La foi rougit de ces indignes alarmes. J’établirai que le papauté temporelle, loin d’être nécessaire ou utile à l’Eglise, fut dès son origine et ne cessa jamais d’être la grande plaie du catholicisme; qu’elle a tout matérialisé, par conséquent tout faussé dans une religion essentiellement spirituelle; qu’elle ne fut pour les papes mêmes que la dégradation et l’asservissement de leur autorité spirituelle. J’établirai que l’indépendance du saint-siège, pour laquelle on réclame de l’or, des biens-fonds, la sanction des traités, repousse comme une contradiction et un outrage ces profanes appuis, et qu’au lieu de tomber sous la domination d’aucun prince, le pape-sujet, nul dans l’Etat, échappe pour jamais aux exigences comme aux faveurs des rois de la terre. Enfin, j’établirai que le retour de la papauté à sa primitive et normale condition, suscitera la réforme et le rajeunissement du catholicisme. Cette réforme sera l’avènement décisif de l’âge moderne, car il mettra fin à la crise religieuse qui dure depuis la Renaissance’ (p. 3). We will not venture to assert that M. Huet *has* proved, to the satisfaction of everybody, all the points he undertakes to establish; much less shall we declare that we agree in all the principles and opinions, political, social, and religious, put forth by the respected author—just the reverse (M. Huet, like his master M. Bordas-Demoulin, entertains somewhat exceptional views on one or two matters); but we must, at any rate, acknowledge that his pamphlet is

written throughout in a very earnest tone and with great ability, and that it contains more than one striking remark expressed in very vigorous language. M. Huet accepts in full the doctrine of the Pope's primacy by Divine right, which is more than the Abbé Guettée and other French ecclesiastics do, but rejects all notions of a 'theoretic sovereignty' as most injurious to the Church. He, however, most enthusiastically predicts the speedy downfall of the Pope's temporal power:—'Oui, le pape va cesser d'être roi, et jamais plus heureuse nouvelle ne fut annoncée à l'Eglise. C'est l'œuvre de la délivrance qui s'accomplit.' Our author looks with anything but disfavour on the 'great principle of '89,' but has a special horror of the Middle Ages. Like the Abbé Guettée, M. Huet greatly deploras the ignorance prevalent on the subject of 'Catholicism' and religion generally among his co-religionists.

We are glad to see a new edition of M. Droz's original and sterling '*Histoire du Règne de Louis XVI. pendant les années où l'on pouvait prévenir ou diriger la Révolution française*' (Paris: Renouard). It is one of the best and most impartial of the many French accounts of the Revolution of 1789; and to those wishing to study the causes which led to that great event, fraught, as it has been, with the most momentous and permanent results, we cordially recommend the book. The introduction, in particular, strikes us as very valuable; it is quite a model of historic research and philosophical investigation, and strongly reminds us of Guizot. We regret, however, the work should terminate with the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly. It should at least have been carried down to the death of Louis XVI. Let us add, that the present edition of the deceased Academician's work is enriched with a notice of his life and works from the pen of a distinguished friend of his—himself one of the most eminent of living historians—M. de Bonnechose. The *Notice sur l'auteur et ses ouvrages* is one of the most finished and appropriate compositions of that nature we have ever read.

The Bishop of Brechin has published a very striking and beautiful sermon, entitled, '*The Sanctity of Christian Art*' (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas). It was preached at the reopening of Rosslyn Chapel, on Easter Tuesday.

The purport of '*Maiden Life, as it is and as it might be*' (London: Masters), is sufficiently indicated by its title. It is an excellent little tract, which may be very beneficially circulated in many quarters.

Mr. Lathbury's pamphlet, '*Facts and Fictions of the Bicentenary; a Sketch from 1640 to 1662*,' not only exposes palpable fictions, but also contains hard facts, which the insidious promoters of the Bicentenary will find it more easy to evade and ignore than to answer. This cheap and useful pamphlet is published by the '*Bristol Church Defence Association*,' and is to be had at Wertheim and Co. We would also recommend, from the same publishers, Mr. Clifford's lecture on a cognate subject, '*The Liberation Society; and to what do its principles tend?*' Equally valuable is '*The Sufferings of the Church and the Intolerance of Dissent: a*

Plain Statement of Facts' (London: Masters), compiled by two English clergymen.

The Abbé Glaire, if we mistake not, Dean of the Faculty of Theology of Paris, and author of an 'Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament,' 'Les Livres Saints vengés,' 'Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum,' 'Principes de Grammaire Arabe,' and other learned works, has undertaken a French translation of the Bible, of which a first instalment—the New Testament—has recently appeared (Paris: Jouby). This work possesses this grand and interesting peculiarity—it is the first French translation of the Bible ever authorized by the Church of Rome. Of course, it is made from the Vulgate: of course, also, before receiving the sanction of the congregation of the Index, it had to undergo certain modifications and corrections. Whether they were as important as those made in Bouillet's well-known Dictionary, once put into the Index, but afterwards sanctioned, on the author's consenting to such corrections as the substitution of 'le célèbre Arnaud' for 'le grand Arnaud,' we are not told. The Abbé Glaire informs us that it was his original intention to republish the De Sacy's version with important changes, but that he subsequently abandoned the design, and decided upon giving a completely new translation. We have not examined very closely the version of the New Testament now before us, but it seems very literal and correct, though it lacks the grace and polished elegance of De Sacy's. We are scarcely able to judge from the instalment now published, but we think we should prefer De Sacy's to Glaire's version, while, on the other hand, Glaire's appears certainly preferable to De Genoude's. M. Glaire has here and there added a few notes in elucidation of the text. When the whole Bible has been published, we may perhaps return to it.

'The Codex Sinaiticus.' From inquiries made at the convent of S. Catharine, Mount Sinai, in the month of February last, it appears that the monks of that convent agree in stating that the above MS. was there from time immemorial. Prof. Tischendorf, they say, came fortified with requests and guarantees from the Grand Duke Constantine, the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople, and other high personages, to have the MS. as a loan. They (the monks) affirm that they have guarantees for its safe return: but the subject is a sore one with them, and the librarian evidently does not put implicit confidence in the guarantees.

Mr. G. W. Cox's 'Tale of the Great Persian War' (Longman) is a worthy sequel to his 'Tales from the Greek Mythology,' to which we called attention about a year ago, being framed on the same plan, but on a larger scale, and with a view to an older class of readers. The conception of the book is a very good one, and well executed. In the first 230 pages Mr. Cox combines into a consecutive narrative those parts of Herodotus which belong to the Persian War, omitting all the less relevant digressions. He wisely confines himself to the resources of our old English language, 'pure and undefiled,' to translate the epic simplicity of the 'Father of History.' In the excursions which form the latter half of the book, historical and philosophical questions of deep interest, on the religious and

political aspect of the history, are handled in a way likely to extend Mr. Cox's reputation as a scholar. His remarks, if not always conclusive nor always free from an undue leaning to the *destructive* school, are always suggestive, and contribute materially towards the solution of some questions which underlie the controversy of the day in many of its phases; questions which commence with the credibility of ancient records, and pass on to the real character of the past, and its true relation to ourselves. We may add, that the 'Great Persian War' will prove especially useful to persons who are debarred by their ignorance of the language from approaching the treasures of Greek literature in their original beauty.

The 'apples of gold in pictures of silver,' are naturally suggested by the appearance of beautiful form and typography applied to words well worthy of such embellishment. A new and much enlarged edition of Mr. Bright's 'Ancient Collects' has very properly received from the publishers (Messrs. J. H. and Jas. Parker) this attention. It is, in every sense, a very beautiful book; and when we consider how few Christians are really capable of throwing their own aspirations into fitting words, of avoiding irreverence and false doctrine, without falling into stiffness and formality, or into weak prolixity and 'vain repetitions,' it is a great privilege to be able to obtain, in so convenient a form, a rich and varied collection of devotions so sound, terse, and majestic in their simplicity, to say nothing of their time-hallowed associations. We have much pleasure in recommending this new edition as an admirable gift-book alike for clergy or laity.

Two valuable discourses against Neologian error, by the Rev. P. G. Medd (who, like Mr. Bright, is a Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford), have been published by request (J. H. and Jas. Parker). They treat respectively of the 'Christian Meaning of the Psalms,' and 'The Supernatural Character and Spiritual Discernment of Christian Truth.' The University Pulpit, from which they were preached, seems to need (and happily obtains) some such counterbalance as these thoughtful and well-balanced pieces of argument. They are singularly free from any violence of statement or misrepresentation of the tendencies of rationalism; and this negative feature is well calculated to lend all the more weight to reasonings not easily to be gainsayed, and set forth in an attractive manner.

Mr. Philip Freeman's 'Vol. II. of Principles of Divine Service' (J. H. and J. Parker) is at length published.